

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

TRINITY COLLEGE
GENERAL LIBRARY
NOV. 27 1929

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A., Hon. Treasurer. L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.
Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A. With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association. E. A. BARBER, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society.
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A. Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHEY, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XLIII

NOVEMBER, 1929

No. 5

CONTENTS

| | PAGE | | PAGE |
|--|------|--|------|
| NOTES AND NEWS | 161 | REVIEWS (continued): | |
| ALT-ITHAKA. A. SHEWAN | 162 | <i>Anthologie Grecque, Tome I. (Waltz).</i> J. U. POWELL | 183 |
| ACCENTS AND THE GREEK IAMBIC LINE. F. R. DALE | 165 | <i>Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe (Reitzenstein).</i> H. J. ROSE | 184 |
| A REFERENCE TO LUCRETII IN CICERO <i>Pro Milone.</i> M. E. HIRST | 166 | <i>The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and his Reign (Runciman).</i> G. BUCKLER | 185 |
| CATULLUS 66 51-4. A. E. HOUSMAN | 168 | <i>Plotins Kategorien der intelligiblen Welt (Nebel); Plotins Leben (Oppermann).</i> E. R. DODDS | 186 |
| SOME AIDS TO CLASSICAL TEACHING. W. E. P. PANTIN | 168 | <i>A History of Greece (Robinson).</i> M. CARY | 187 |
| REVIEWS: | | <i>Jephthah (Christopherson).</i> E. HARRISON | 189 |
| <i>Andrew Lang's Work for Homer (Shewan).</i> G. MURRAY | 169 | <i>A Greek-English Lexicon, Part IV. (Liddell and Scott).</i> E. HARRISON | 189 |
| <i>Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas (Mühl).</i> P. N. URE | 170 | <i>Hannibal als Politiker (Groag).</i> G. H. STEVENSON | 190 |
| <i>Some Greek Love Poems (Edmonds).</i> S. GASELEE | 172 | <i>Cicero: De Re Publica, De Legibus (Keyes).</i> G. B. A. FLETCHER | 191 |
| <i>Greek Lyric Metre (Thomson).</i> H. D. F. KITTO | 173 | <i>Cicero: The Letters to His Friends, Vols. I., II. (Williams).</i> W. T. VESLEY | 191 |
| <i>Pindar's Odes of Victory (Billson).</i> D. S. ROBERTSON | 174 | <i>Ovide. Héroïdes (Bornecque et Prévost).</i> A. E. HOUSMAN | 194 |
| <i>A Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture (Robertson).</i> W. R. LETHBRIDGE | 175 | <i>The Roman Fort at Old Kilpatrick (Miller).</i> D. ATKINSON | 197 |
| <i>Die antike Menschheitsidee (Mühl).</i> R. B. OMANS | 176 | <i>Some Class-books.</i> W. E. P. PANTIN | 198 |
| <i>Platonism (Burnet).</i> P. W. DODD | 178 | | |
| <i>Demosthenes gegen Aphobos (Schwahn).</i> M. CARY | 179 | SHORT NOTICES | 200 |
| <i>On Alexander's Track to the Indus (Stein).</i> W. W. TARN | 180 | BOOKS RECEIVED | 207 |
| <i>New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature; Second Series (Powell and Barber).</i> C. M. BOWRA | 181 | | |

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. A. Pitman, 4, Prince's Buildings, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. K. Wakefield, Maidstone Girls' Grammar School, Kent; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. G. W. Dyson, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

By ERNEST WEEKLEY, M.A.

AN ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH

42s. net.

A CONCISE ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH

This is an abridgment of the author's *Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*.
7s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR WEEKLEY has set a new fashion in dealing with the fascinating subject of the history of words. He has a singularly happy knack of combining entertainment with sound scholarship, and his books are packed with curious information set forth in an interesting way, attractive alike to the ordinary reader and to the student.

They are delightful volumes to have at hand to dip into from time to time; one can open them at any page with the certainty of being deeply interested.

WORDS ANCIENT & MODERN. 5s. net.

MORE WORDS ANCIENT & MODERN. 5s. net.

THE ROMANCE OF NAMES. 6s. net.

THE ROMANCE OF WORDS. 6s. net.

SURNAMES. 6s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

E.
m
R
in
or
su
it
w
j
h
m
o
b
I
a
t
t
t
o
s
t
n
c

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1929

NOTES AND NEWS

THE death, at a ripe age, of Professor E. A. Sonnenschein calls for more than merely formal notice in the *Classical Review*; for he was not only a fine and industrious scholar, but one of the originators, and a constant and active supporter, of the Classical Association itself. He may rank with Postgate, whom he did not long outlive, as its joint founder, for it was a letter from him to Postgate which set the movement of 1903 in action. He was one of the seven signatories of the circular by which the historic meeting of that December was convoked. In his speech at the meeting he laid stress on what the main work and aim of the Association should be: first, giving evidence to the world of the large body of educated opinion that does not regard a classical education as an antiquated superstition; secondly, teaching our teachers, including ourselves, how the ideal of a classical education may be made a living reality. This is the work on which for five-and-twenty years the Classical Association, not without success, has been engaged; this is the aim which it still sets before itself.

He and Postgate were appointed joint secretaries when the Council was formed, and from 1904 until 1910 Sonnenschein held this office, in which he spared neither time nor trouble. He was made a Vice-President in 1911 and re-elected annually thereafter; he continued almost until the last to be a regular attendant at meetings of Council and to take an active part in its proceedings. He was for many years Chairman of the Standing Committee on Grammatical Reform; and while he made his first reputation by his editorial and critical work on Plautus, and while in recent years he broke fresh ground by his valuable studies on Rhythm, it was Grammar, in the largest sense of that word, to which he mainly devoted himself. *The Unity of the Latin Subjunctive* (1910) and the *New Latin*

Grammar (1912) are the most prominent of the many contributions he made to the scientific study of language. But he was a constructive as well as an analytic mind; language, and grammar as the mechanism of language, were to him live things. When he retired in 1918 from the Chair which he had held for thirty-five years in the University of Birmingham, his interest in the study of language only increased; it bore its last fruit in *The Soul of Grammar* (1927), a phrase which to him had a very real and vital meaning.

Modest, unselfish, transparently simple, he won the regard of all his colleagues. His courtesy was unfailing. If his mind worked more slowly and with less agility than those of some others, his steady enthusiasm was not appreciated least by those who found themselves obliged to differ from him on questions whether of theory or of tactics. His services and his character should be, and will be, remembered both by the now fast-dwindling company of those who were associated with him five-and-twenty years ago, and by their successors who work in new fields, but will reap in them much of what was then sown.

A handsome memorial of the Jubilee celebrations of the Hellenic Society, in June, 1929, is the *History of the Hellenic Society, 1879-1929*, by Mr. George A. Macmillan, reprinted from *J.H.S.*, Vol. XLIX., Part I. Mr. Macmillan was the first Honorary Secretary of the Society; he was its historian for the semi-jubilee celebrations in 1904; and once again, as Honorary Treasurer, he writes of the successful work of a quarter of a century. No man has served the Society and the cause for which it stands more loyally or more unobtrusively; his record of its work, *cuius pars magna fuit*, has both historical value and personal interest.

L

Mr. Basil Anderton, the indefatigable Honorary Secretary of the Northumberland and Durham Branch of the Classical Association, has prepared and published *A Second Record of Classical Activities, being Vignettes of Meetings during Seven Years from October, 1922, to July, 1929*. This is a sequel to his account of the first ten years' work of

the Branch, published in 1922; and it sets an example which other Branches might well imitate. We all envy the Northumberland and Durham Branch its Wall, and the use that it can make of magic names like Amboglanna and Otterburn while other Branches hibernate in June and July.

ALT-ITHAKA.

THERE is little that is new on the subject of Leukas-Ithaka in Dr. Dörpfeld's recent work *Alt-Ithaka*. To refute his arguments would be merely to repeat the refutations that have appeared—most of them in Germany—during the last twenty-five years. But consideration of a few leading points will suffice to show how weak the case for Leukas-Ithaka is.

First, let it be understood that it is vitiated by two fundamental errors. The first, that the *Odyssey* makes the realm of Odysseus consist of the four principal islands, has been frequently exposed. The other is that in the repeated line, *Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ Ἰθάκησσα Ζάκυνθος*, the *τε . . . τε* shows that Dulichium and Same are an *inner pair enclosed by* Zacynthus and Ithaka. There is no warrant for this.

Then let it be borne in mind that the theory requires the rejection of the *Catalogue of the Ships*, of *ω*, and of the opening of *ο*, and occasional manipulation of the text, for the justification of which we are referred to Dörpfeld's recent edition of the *Odyssey*.

And not only that, but we are also required to accept the very remarkable results achieved in that edition. Theoclymenus is Athene! The action of the poem originally occupied just ten days. Ogygia is in the extreme south of Italy, and Kirke's isle in the extreme south of Africa, with Laestrygonia adjoining it. And so on.

And then consider the violence that has been done to the Homeric language. For *πορθμός*, etc., see J.H.S. XXXIV. 227 ff. For *χθαμαλός*, the worst case of all, I refer to a paper about to appear in the *Classical Journal*.

The word in Greek means 'low,' 'low lying,' except to some puzzled interpreters of whom Strabo had heard. Paulatos informs us that the modern Greek terms *χαμηλά* and *χαμούνει*, by which it is sought to establish the sense of 'adjoining the coast,' may be used of a ship, but *not* of an island near the coast; and Dörpfeld's argument from Aeaea and Laestrygonia deserves no attention. To realise how well *χθαμαλός* in the sense of 'low' suits Thiaki, especially against the heights of Cefalonia, draw its outline in vertical section, and bear in mind that the length of the island is some *forty* times the greatest height in it. *ἀμφιάλος* now connotes the contrast between the 'wild' open ocean to the north and the 'quiet' enclosed water to the south of the isthmus of Leukas. *πολυβενθής* is no longer 'very deep,' but *tief sich ins Land erstreckend*. *ἐκὰς νήσων* had, once upon a time, to mean *zwischen den Inseln durch, aber fern von ihnen*. *εὐδείελος* is *schönabendlich*, 'beautifully western'; but that is not insisted on. For the *νήσου θαλά* some Leukadists have suggested that they are not the Echinades, but that Telemachus 'directed his course' to the 'swiftly-gliding-past islands'! Dörpfeld, by the way, adheres to Bérard's absurd identification with the Montague Rocks, which Bérard now admits was a 'gross error.' *ἀκτὴ ἡπίρροιο* suits the classical Nerikos, the only known Nerikos, perfectly; but another is needed, and one is found far inland, to which *ἀκτὴ*, if regard be had to its Homeric uses, cannot apply. *δρόμος* is now *Fahrstrasse*, a meaning not given in any of the five lexicons I have consulted. Even the

little joke—as it was universally considered in pre-Dörpfeldian days, even by Leaf himself before he became a convert to Leukas-Ithaka—in the enquiry of newcomers must now take on a serious complexion. We may surely say that it is an extraordinary thing that the correct interpretations have been hidden for ages, and are only now revealed to Dörpfeld, Goessler, and Rüter. All this will constitute to later generations a real curiosity in Homeric enquiry; but the unfortunate point is that the practice has spread, so that in various ramifications of the controversy *κραναός*, *παιπαλόεις*, *μεσσηγύς*, *ἐπιωγή*, *ναύλοχος*, *παραπλήξ* and *ἀντιπέρατα*, have all been subjected to the squeezing process.

It is claimed that with Leukas recognised as the Homeric Ithaka all is *klar* and *einfach*, and that all difficulties disappear. There seem to be some still:

1. The epithets and descriptions are surely fatal. Leukas could not possibly be said to be *οὐκ εὐρεία* and *οὐχ ἰππήλατος*, and does not correspond to the offer of Menelaus in δ 176. *ἀμφιάλος* alone seems to be decisive. Again, considerably more than half the action of the *Odyssey* is in Ithaka, which is mentioned with epithets over and over again, yet there is no reference to the white cliffs which are such a conspicuous feature of Leukas scenery.

2. What necessity could there be for Noemon, δ 630 ff., to take his mares to Elis, a journey there and back of about 120 miles by sea, with the plains of Leukas at his disposal and the pastures of the mainland close by?

3. In ω 430 ff. Eupheithes fears Odysseus may escape to Pylos or Elis. Naturally, if he was in Thiaki. But if he was in Leukas, surely Eupheithes would think of Acarnania.

4. Arkoudi is impossible as the Homeric Asteris. It has, as Bérard and others have shown, no haven that could shelter a ship. And for Athene to send Telemachus past it was, as Bérard puts it, *Navigations d'Ulysse* I. 417, *tout à la fois une sottise et une trahison*. The youth goes to certain death. And his father too—with no Athene-Theoclymenus to protect him!—coming down from Corfu. Strange

that the poet should have overlooked the danger to Odysseus! And the Wooers could never have gone for ambush to Arkoudi out in the open sea, with a suitable haven in the islet of Theleia nearer home, and with two good ones—*treffliche Häfen* Bursian calls them—in the north end of Meganisi.

And there is good reason for believing that Arkoudi is the Krokyleia of the *Catalogue* (*Class. Phil.* XXIII. 118 f.), and so cannot be the Asteris of the *Odyssey*.

On the other hand, it has been shown in C.P. XXIII. 119 ff. that it is in the highest degree probable that Daskalio, the Asteris of the Ithakists, had havens three thousand years ago good enough at least for the poet to use in his story. The negative the Leukadists have to prove is that there were none at that time. In every other point the islet corresponds to the Homeric description. *ἄκριες* does not necessarily mean 'heights'; and, if it must, the poet does not say they were in Asteris. He may refer to the hills of Cefalonia close to the islet.

6. A comparison of the Nidri site for the capital of the island realm with Polis in Thiaki is very greatly in favour of the latter, which is admirably situated for purposes of government, trade, and piracy. The Leukas site, in a low-lying plain—though, as Bérard points out, there is a splendid site close by for a genuine Achaean *haute ville*—is at one end of the supposed kingdom of Odysseus, separated from the open sea and islands by a narrow channel, in which navigation is hazardous at any time, and so bad at night that the experienced captain of Bérard's yacht would not undertake it. And the capital haven is *not πολυβενθής*.

7. There is no ground for believing in the *Völker-* and *Namenverschiebungen* suggested. They are merely postulated to complete the Leukas-Ithaka theory. It is incredible that the expelled Ithakans should go no farther away from their Dorian enemies than Thiaki; it is incredible also that the Corinthians in a later century found no local tradition of the greatest national hero of Greece, no glorious heroic past to revive.

8. A point is made of the number of

Wooers. The largest band, of fifty-two, is from Dulichium, so, as Cefalonia is the largest island, it must be Dulichium. The argument loses all force when one reflects that Leukas, if Ithaka, supplies only twelve. Cefalonia with its Monte Negro, which far surpasses in height any other mountain in these islands, is surely Same, 'the height.' With Leukas = Dulichium, difficulties seem to be reduced to a minimum.

9. It has been admitted by some on both sides of the dispute that the *Λευκὰς Πιέρη* of *ω* 11, that is Cap Dukato in Leukas, is not in the Homeric Ithaka.

10. The question to newcomers shows that the enquirer is speaking in an island. He begins with the assumption that the stranger has come in a 'ship.' Just so in *ω* 299 ff. And you need a 'ship' to leave the island, *σ* 84 and 115, and *φ* 307.

These, it is submitted, are considerations that tell strongly against Leukas-Ithaka. But when we reflect in addition that the proof proceeds from two ungrounded assumptions, that our assent is required to Dörpfeld's views of late and early in the epics, and also to his new and startling ideas as to the action of the *Odyssey*, and, finally, when we recall the pressure put on words and phrases to compel a favourable sense, we must surely say it requires some hardihood to describe the theory as *auf wissenschaftlichem Fundament aufgebaute*, while the Ithakists have built *auf Sand*. In sober truth there is little to be said for it.

The *παννπερτάτη* of *ι* 25 has inclined some to the Leukas view. But (1) no one can say for certain that the word means more than 'very far up' (*C.P.* XIX. 298 f.); (2) the comparison is between Ithaka and islands east of it, and to say that it is farthest up of all is quite accurate (*C.P.* XII. 136 f.); and (3) even if the word be taken at its worst, the error may be admitted without much detriment to the geography generally. But (4) be it observed that, if the word be held to make Thiaki impossible, then similarly the *ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆσου* of *ι* 22 f. and the *μετόπισθε* of *ν* 241 rule Leukas out entirely.

The fact seems to be, as authorities on both sides have argued, that *ι* 24 is

a gloss. It makes the meaning obscure; it occurs several times elsewhere, and the MS. authority is not unanimous. In such circumstances a line in any other Greek poem would be condemned at once. But let no Ithakist dare to make that suggestion here. That is rank blasphemy to some who can cheerfully cut out the *Catalogue, ω*, an inconvenient passage in *ο*, and can remake the *Odyssey* just as they would have it to be.

The fact that there is not exact correspondence between the topographical references of the *Odyssey* and actuality in Thiaki has also influenced some writers against that island. But Leukas is in even worse case. Dörpfeld seems to be far too ready with his identifications. But let those who object to the grotto on Thiaki and have a doubt about Neion turn to Leukas, and reflect that Neriton-Stavrotas is not visible, as (*ν* 351) it must be, from Phorkys-Syvota; that the capital haven, Vlichos, does not correspond to the Odyssean descriptions of comings and goings; that Skydi is an impossible landing-place for Telemachus if he is to escape the Wooers; that Nidri could never have been chosen as the site of the capital of the island kingdom; that Dörpfeld's location of Eumaeus is, Paulatos declares, in a hollow, the *περίσκηπτος χώρος* of *ξ* 6 becoming a *περίφρακτον δεσμωτήριον*; and that the haven Rheithron simply cannot be found. It is useless to reply regarding the latter that it cannot be found on Thiaki, for either Aphalos or Phrikes suits perfectly; the poet does not happen to supply data on which we can decide. Now Dörpfeld, unlike most participants in the controversy, demands complete topographical correspondence. That cannot be predicated of Leukas.

Dörpfeld's very peculiar views on Mycenaean archaeology, to which so much space is devoted in *Alt-Ithaka*, and which do not appear to have gained much acceptance, are of little importance for present purposes, nor is his identification of a Nidri building with the palace of Odysseus. His chief ground for the identification seems to be that he has proved Leukas to be the Homeric Ithaka, but that has still to be done.

A. SHEWAN.

ACCENTS AND THE GREEK IAMBIC LINE.

THE Report of the Committee on Greek Accentuation, published in the Classical Association's *Proceedings*, Vol. XXV. (January, 1928), accepts, and does much to establish, the general trustworthiness of the traditional accentuation of Greek. Yet no one, except Dr. Rouse and a few who have followed him, pronounces the traditional accents. It seems that those of us who teach Greek, in schools or Universities, have been rather indolent or rather incompetent in this matter. It is true that the evidence is not overwhelmingly conclusive—there are grounds for misgiving as to whether the accents as we have them are what was heard in fifth-century Athens. But somewhere near it they must be; and if, because of that small uncertainty, we adopt in practice what we know to be the wrong kind of accent, falling definitely on the wrong syllables, it seems a desperate thing to do. We use in reading Greek the Latin stress-accent under 'the penultima law.' Yet we actually write the traditional accents of Greek. This proceeding, though irrational, is convenient: we use, in speaking or reading aloud, only one accent for the two classical languages. Can we offer any theoretical justification for the practice?

Professor Gilbert Murray, in *The Classical Tradition in Poetry*, pp. 84 ff., writes: 'Many small phenomena in verse would seem to suggest the presence of a slight stress-accent more or less like that which is traditional in Latin . . . and most Indo-European languages: that is, a tendency to stress the penultimate when it is long, otherwise the ante-penultimate. . . . For instance, such a word as *πατέρα* occurs very often in verse in such a position that the stress naturally falls on the first syllable and very rarely otherwise (normally *χαίρεις ὄρων φῶς, πατέρα δ' οὐ χαίρειν δοκéis*, rarely *τί γὰρ κακῶν ἄπεστι; τὸν | πατέρα | πατήρ*).'

It is true that if we are used to reading with the Latin accent we can read Pheres' remark with more satisfaction to ourselves if we stress the first syllable of *πατέρα*. This satisfaction

may seem, at best, a weak foundation on which to build a theory of pronouncing Greek; but it is worth while to test the suggestion by looking at the passages in iambic verse where *πατέρα* appears. Turning first naturally to Aristophanes' *Birds*—the passage where the *πατραλοίας* comes in—we find five instances of *πατέρα* coinciding with a foot (once the second, four times the fourth) in fifteen lines (1350-1364), and only two instances (1348 and 1368) of *τὸν πατέρα* at the beginning of the line. Comic verse is of course not the same thing as tragic: but if *πατέ|ρα* sounded more effective in any kind of verse than *|πατέρα|*, Aristophanes would have put it where he wanted it. However, if Aristophanes should not be convincing, Sophocles is no light matter. In the *Oedipus Rex* I find five examples of *πατέρα* (one of which is indeed quoted by Professor Murray):

826 μητρός ζυγῆραι καὶ | πατέρα | κατακτανεῖν
955 ἐκ τῆς Κορίνθου, πατέ|ρα τὸν σὸν ἀγγελῶν
967 κτενεῖν ἐμελλον πατέ|ρα τὸν ἐμὸν; ὁ δὲ θανὼν
1372 |πατέρα| ποτ' ἂν προσεῖδον εἰς Ἄιδου μολῶν
1496 τί γὰρ κακῶν ἄπεστι; τὸν | πατέρα | πατήρ.

The other examples in Sophocles are these: *|πατέρα|* occurs in *Phil.* 1314; *El.* 279, 588, 1361, 1496; *Trach.* 740. *πατέ|ρα* occurs in *Phil.* 665; *Ajax* 506; *El.* 368, 558; *Trach.* 364, 1138; *O.C.* 508, 1356. Thus in all there are nine instances of *|πατέρα|* and ten of *πατέ|ρα*. I have not made a complete count in the other tragedians—indeed, I may have missed one or two in Sophocles. *|πατέρα|* is rare in Aeschylus, though he certainly uses it: in those plays of Euripides where I have made a count I find *πατέ|ρα* rather more frequent than *|πατέρα|*. But as *|πατέρα|* occurs four times in the *Hercules Furens* alone, the idea that it appears 'rarely,' in Euripides either, must be definitely given up. It is clearly quite common, and the tragedians are indifferent: they use at will either *|πατέρα|* or *πατέ|ρα*.

Professor Murray speaks of 'many small phenomena' in verse. If anyone living has a delicately sensitive ear for verse it is Professor Murray. But if the unspecified phenomena are smaller

than the phenomenon he mentions, they must surely be small indeed.¹

No poet can ever write a line without the sound of it in his mind's ear. No Greek poet can ever have written a line without having the sounds of the accents present in his thought. An iambic line without the accents cannot be the line as Aeschylus or Sophocles conceived it.

In dealing with the Latin hexameter we know where we are—not fully perhaps; but the simple fact that the accent falls regularly on the first syllable of the fifth and sixth feet shows how it worked in the line. In the first four feet, of course, it falls differently—

Tityre|, tú pátu|lae récu|bans sub | tégmīne|
fági

Silvēs|trem ténu|i Mú|sam medi|táris a|véna—
in a constantly changing pattern, which together with the choice of dactyl or spondee gives life and infinite variety to the lines. We can see Virgil getting definite effects by his use of accents—the shudder in

terríbi|li admóni|tu horrífí|cant

or the 'swimmy' feeling in

con|díctue na|tántia | lúmina | sómnus.

On the other hand, when he writes

ímpiu|s háec tam | cúlta no|vália | mīles
ha|bébit?

we can hardly feel that the unusual regularity of the accent's position in the foot secures any definite effect which a displacement or two would have spoiled: it is simply a matter of variety—no two lines are the same. I have been tempted to find effects achieved by accent in the Greek iambic: but I do not know enough about it to try. The accent gave variety—beyond what was given by the interposition of spondees in the allowed feet. That is a fact of which there simply can be no doubt. When

¹ See, however, his footnote on p. 85 *op. cit.* I am prepared to answer it fully: but that means too long an argument, for this occasion, on points of detail.

once the effort has been made to give value to accents, the mere difference in the last two feet between *νέα τροφή* and *πρέπων ἔφους* and *εἰδὼς πλέον* becomes a significant difference. Each line gets its character, not merely from its distinctive form, but also from its accents. I am not an expert in pronouncing Greek: I have merely tried to learn from Dr. Rouse. But my own experience, if it is worth anything, is this—that where one becomes familiar with a line or a passage, accents and all, there is a definite feeling of gain. To pronounce

πατέρα τε μητρός της ἐμῆς, πόλυν γέλων

as

πάτερα τε μήτρος της ἑμης, πόλυν γέλων

(if for the moment I may write accents to indicate stress) seems, when you know the line, a barbarism which destroys the character of the verse. To claim that by such efforts as we can make we recapture in full the sound and spirit of Greek poetry would no doubt be going too far. But because that is so to subject Greek verse regularly to what must be perversion and distortion seems absurd. If only one step in the right direction can be made, it is worth making—if we care for the poets.

On the general question of the expediency of making effective use of Greek accents I cannot claim space to speak. If there are any arguments in favour of the Latin accent in Greek—apart from its convenience—I hope they may appear. Meanwhile perhaps what I have written may do something towards clearing the ground for the study of Greek verse—which with a Latin accent is not Greek verse. If we feel concerned, as surely we must, with getting as near as we can to the richness and beauty of iambic or hexameter, we can begin by putting aside a fundamental obstruction.

F. R. DALE.

A REFERENCE TO LUCRETIUS IN CICERO *PRO MILONE*.

IN February, 54 B.C., about four months after the death of Lucretius, Cicero, in a note to his brother Quintus (*Ad Q. Fratrem* II. 9), made his well-known criticism on *De rerum natura*.

Commentators point out that, although this is his only mention of the poet, his philosophical works show the influence of the poem. 'Cicero's philosophical works were all written within a few

years after this poem was published, and they afford many proofs that Cicero was familiar with its language.¹ In four instances Munro quotes passages where Cicero seems to echo the phrases or thought of *De rerum natura* (on II. 1092, *Tusc. disp.* I. 48; on III. 983, *De fin.* I. 60; on IV. 1070, *Tusc. disp.* IV. 75; on VI. 396, *De divin.* II. 44). The dates of composition, however, of these works are more accurately expressed as 'from eight to ten years,' rather than 'within a few years,' after the publication of the poem. There is an extant work of Cicero, standing considerably nearer in time to the date of *De rerum natura*, which contains a curious and almost irrelevant digression, and in this there seem to be distinct traces of Lucretian influence. The *Pro Milone*, in the finished form in which we possess it, is not of course the speech made in court in April, 52 B.C., but it was presumably rewritten almost at once and published not many months later, before Cicero left for Cilicia in May, 51 B.C.

Towards the end of the speech Cicero claims that the death of Clodius was of such benefit to the state that Milo might well admit responsibility for it. He continues (§§ 83-4):

Sed huius beneficii gratiam, iudices, fortuna populi Romani et vestra felicitas et di immortales sibi deberi putant. Nec vero quisquam aliter arbitrari potest, nisi qui nullam vim esse ducit numenve divinum, quem neque imperii nostri magnitudo neque sol ille nec caeli signorumque motus nec vicissitudines rerum atque ordines movent neque, id quod maximum est, maiorum sapientia, qui sacra, qui caerimonias, qui auspicia et ipsi sanctissime coluerunt et nobis suis posteris prodiderunt. Est, est profecto illa vis, neque in his corporibus atque in hac imbecillitate nostra inest quiddam quod vigeat et sentiat, non inest in hoc tanto naturae tam praeclaro motu. Nisi forte idcirco non putant, quia non apparet et cernitur, proinde quasi nostram ipsam mentem, qua sapimus, qua providemus, qua haec ipsa agimus et dicimus videre aut plane, qualis aut ubi sit, sentire possimus.

Cicero is here controverting, irrelevantly to his main argument, views which deny the presence of a divine power controlling the world, and which do not admit as proofs of such power either the ordered harmony of nature

(especially the regular courses of the heavenly bodies) or the general belief in it shown by the religious practices handed down from past generations.

This denial and this rejection of such proofs form the very essence of Lucretius' argument, which Cicero must have read about two years earlier as one of the general public or, more probably, as editor of the poem before publication.

The denial of a controlling divine power is enforced by Lucretius almost at the outset (I. 149-54):

Principium cuius hinc nobis exordia sumet
Nullam rem e nilo gigni divinitus unquam
Quippe ita formido mortalis continet omnis,
Quod multa in terris fieri caeloque tument
Quorum operum causas nulla ratione videre
Possunt ac fieri divino numine rentur.

The *multa in terris caeloque* (the *caeli signorumque motus* and the *vicissitudines rerum atque ordines* of Cicero) are further explained in II. 167 ff.:

At quidam contra haec, ignari materiai,
Naturam non posse deum sine numine credunt
Tanto opere humanis rationibus admoderate
Tempora mutare annorum frugesque creare.

This view he rebuts by the passionate assertion (II. 178-81, repeated V. 195-9) that he can prove *ex ipsis caeli rationibus*

Nequaquam nobis divinitus esse creatam
Naturam mundi: tanta stat praedita culpa.

Yet these very *caeli rationes* had filled Lucretius' mind with awe and wonder. In V. 1183-7 he attributes man's belief in the gods to the same causes as Cicero:

Praeterea caeli rationes ordine certo
Et varia annorum cernebant tempora verti
Nec poterant quibus id fierent cognoscere causis.
Ergo perfrugium sibi habebant omnia divis
Tradere et illorum nutu facere omnia flecti.

And in the strange passage which follows his brilliant attack on conventional *pietas* he admits their power over himself (V. 1204-10):

Nam cum suspicimus magni caelestia mundi
Templa, . . .
Et venit in mentem solis lunaeque viarum;
then fear (like a deadly snake) rears its head:

Nequa forte deum nobis immensa potestas
Sit, vario motu quae candida sidera verset.

The *sapientia maiorum*, which in Cicero's eyes established the worship of the gods with its pious observances, was to Lucretius *metus* (V. 73) and *mortalibus insitus horror* (V. 1165). There is

¹ Munro, note on Lucretius II. 1092.

no divine spirit immanent in hoc tanto naturae tam praeclaro motu, but nature—

dominis privata superbis
Ipsa sua per se sponte omnia dis agere expers
(II. 1091-2).

Mortali consistere corpore mundum

is his assertion elsewhere (V. 65), and most emphatic of all (V. 156 ff.):

Dicere porro hominum causa voluisse parare
Praeclaram mundi naturam . . .
Desiperest.

MARGARET E. HIRST.

CATULLUS 66 51-4.

abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores
lugebant, cum se Memnonis Aethiopis
unigena impellens nutantibus aera pennis
obtulit Arsinoes Locricos ales equos.

THE rivalry between Zephyr and the ostrich for a place in Arsinoe's household is terminated by the publication in *Stud. ital. di fil. cl.* VII. (1929) p. 9 of the Greek original, γνωτὸς Μέμνονος Διθίοπο[ς] [ἐ]το κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερὰ θήλῃς ἀήτης [λάτρης] ἐρ[ξ]ῶνον Λοκρικὸς Ἀρσινόης. But the chief obstacle to Zephyr's appointment, and the chief recommendation of his competitor, still remains: remains at least in the current text of Catullus. *ales equos* describes an ostrich very well, and at Helicon there was a statue of Arsinoe riding on an ostrich. But the Winds are not horses but horsemen, Eur. *Phoen.* 211 Ζεφύρου . . . ἰππεύσαντος, Hor. *carm.* IV 443 f. *ceu* . . . *Eurus* . . . *equitavit*, or charioteers, Verg. *Aen.* II 417 f. *laetus Eois* | *Eurus equis*, Val. Fl. I 611 f. *Thraces equi* (the horses of Boreas) *Zephyrusque et nocti concolor alas* . . . *Notus*. It was not only useless but injudicious to adduce Hom. *Il.* XX 223 f., where

Boreas puts on the shape of a horse for the purpose of deception, as Saturn also did, and as Jove put on many shapes.

The reading of the MSS. however is not this but *alis equos*, and it is an ancient reading. Hyg. *astr.* II 24 *hanc Berenicen non nulli cum Callimacho dixerunt equos alere* is probably not from the pen of the mythographer, but is in MSS which are much older than Catullus's and whose archetype was also older. It appears that Catullus coined *alisequos* on the analogy of *pedisequos*, so signifying his agreement with the general opinion that this compound is of the same sort as *uentriloquus* and *ueliuolus* and *remiuagus*, the nominal element denoting the instrument, not the object, of the verbal action. *odori-sequus* may be either *qui odorem* or *odore sequitur*.

Achilles Statius is now praised for having hit on the true correction *Locricos* for *elocridicos*. That was a lucky chance: he deserves much more credit for refusing to allow that Zephyr was a horse and conjecturing *alisequus*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

SOME AIDS TO CLASSICAL TEACHING.

AMONG the aids to classical teaching are the gramophone records of short lectures, published by the International Educational Society (91, Petty France, Westminster, S.W. 1). As the President, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, says, 'There will always be a certain proportion of the human race who can absorb information more easily from the voice than from print, and where, as in the teaching of music or of a foreign language, sound forms an important element in instruction, the gramophone is clearly better than the printed book.'

A gramophone lecture is obviously more useful in the classroom than a broadcast lesson. The teacher remains master of the situation. He knows exactly what is coming; he can lead up to the lecture and connect it with what the class has been reading; he can begin it at any minute, repeat a passage if it seems desirable, stop to discuss some difficulty, and so on. Professor R. S. Conway contributes *inter alia* four introductory lectures on Vergil and three on Livy, and Professor A. Y. Campbell gives an Introduction to

Greek Drama. Professor Conway's lecture, 'Specimen Passages from Latin Authors—as a Guide to Correct Pronunciation,' will be useful, especially to the teacher. It is not easy to reach in any school a high and uniform standard of pronunciation from a printed description of the sounds. This record enables one to hear four short extracts from Livy, Catullus, Vergil, and Horace well read. A few more like it would be welcome.

In *Ante Oculos*¹ there is a mine of valuable information, much of which is not easily to be found elsewhere. It will be useful not only to teachers but to all who are interested in classical studies. It includes a long list of illustrated books, with full information as to size, price, etc. Mr. Penoyre's short descriptive notes are, I need hardly say,

¹ *Ante Oculos*. Pictures useful for Classical Teaching in Schools, with an Appendix on the Use of Lantern Slides, by John Penoyre.

Advisory Leaflet No. 3 issued by the Councils of the Societies for the Promotion of Hellenic and Roman Studies. Pp. 60. Oxford: University Press, 1929. 2s. 6d.

excellent, and add greatly to the usefulness of the list—e.g. on E. Strong, *La Scultura Romana*: 'This Italian edition of Mrs. Strong's work has more numerous, larger, and better pictures than the single-volume English edition.' It includes too a list of wall pictures, with hints as to their use—e.g., 'The great thing is to start with a set of frames so constructed that the pictures can be changed when desired.' It gives information about the photographs, picture postcards, illustrated catalogues, etc., published by the Museums of Europe and America. In the section on Roman Provincial Civilisation Britain is treated very fully. Most of the books listed are in the library of the Hellenic and Roman Societies, which is peculiarly rich in archaeological books and in periodicals. This pamphlet will make the library more widely known. Let me add that it is a very good place to work in. One can find a book for oneself in a very few minutes, and in case of need one can be sure of courteous help from the staff.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

REVIEWS

ANDREW LANG AND HOMER.

Andrew Lang's Work for Homer. By ALEXANDER SHEWAN. Pp. 30. Oxford University Press, 1929. 2s. net.

ANDREW LANG certainly deserved to have a lecture founded in his honour, and St. Andrew's, to which he was so much attached, was clearly the right place for it. Personally I can never forget my debt to Lang, since it was he who first persuaded a publisher to take any book of mine; but more disinterested judges will agree in recalling the impression of extraordinary brilliance which he made on his contemporaries. In his generation at Oxford, it is said, he towered without rival. He was a wit, a poet, a scholar, an anthropologist, an historian; a writer of romances and detective stories; a curiously brilliant journalist; and the pearls which dropped from his mouth were always dropped with an air of nonchalance, as if the

things which the speaker really cared about were of far superior quality. He was full of kindness and brimming over with prejudice. He wrote incessantly and he loved controversy. He was a wonderful amateur, and he enjoyed drawing—and sometimes quartering—the professionals.

He was usually so much cleverer than the professionals were. He took up mythology; wrote a brilliantly suggestive book, and proceeded to attack and destroy Max Müller, then at the height of his fame. He made people almost afraid to mention Sun Myths until some years after his death. He took up anthropology, threw vivid light therefrom on Greek myths and customs, and then became obsessed by a passion for demolishing the imposing edifice built up by Sir James Frazer. He took up psychical research, and criticised with

great force both the believers and the disbelievers. In fact, it seemed as if he had a sort of artist's intolerance towards anyone who built up a coherent system and a reputation without having as much poetry and wit as himself. His 'sniping' was a fine art.

On Homer Lang and I differed, though he was always kind to me, and used to say: 'Hawks dinna peck hawks' een'; and I always learnt something from his books. He had a vast and vivid knowledge of curious details—scattered details, never forming a whole but capable of illustrating almost any subject. I do not think he had a very clear, positive conception about the Homeric Poems, but he had a burning conviction that critics were mostly wrong, at any rate if they were German. He felt the unity of the Poems, but hardly tried to realise the diversity on which it was imposed. He did good service in helping to destroy the old mechanical 'interpolation' theory, which had imposed even on Leaf, and he was often able to show that a practice which some critic thought absurd (Mr. Shewan instances giving wine to horses) was historically justified. But he was really dominated by a romantic conception of the Homeric Age as a *juventus mundi*, in which 'le monde naît, Homère chante.' He did not like to see criticism applied to Homer at all, and could be almost as cutting about the champions of 'historicity' as about those of myth.

Mr. Shewan writes with loyal friendship and appreciation. But he exaggerates Lang's own tendency to treat every difficult problem as a battle between light and darkness. Of my views

he has a somewhat hazy notion, not apparently having read my third edition. He speaks (p. 5) of 'Wolfian methods' when he means a method which Wolf specially deprecates; he does not realise the significance of the 'heroic age' analysed by Professor Chadwick (p. 18); he takes as certain that the Poems were composed 'purely for the pleasure of lords and ladies' (p. 6), when the only information we have shows them recited at a Panegyris; he says the Poems describe the poet's own time, in spite of the differences between the narrative and the similes, and the contrasts between the heroes and *οἱ τοὺν ἑσπορίων εἰσὶ*; he seems to think that to believe that the Catalogue is an ancient document is to believe that the text of it has never been affected. But it is ungracious to multiply such instances.

Lang once came so far as to agree with me that there must have been *remaniements* of the epic tale of Troy and that in fact our *Iliad* was one *remaniement*; he also admitted that expurgation was a *vera causa*. If I could have got him one step further, to agree that the earliest certain fact known about the Poems is that they were recited at the Panathenaea, and that all our conceptions of their earlier history are based on conjectures and analogies, the two hawks would have ceased to harbour, even in thought, any designs on one another's eyes.

I should like to add that Mr. Shewan's eloquent closing words about the value of Greek studies, though perhaps difficult to reconcile with his low opinion of the intelligence of most Greek scholars, command my warmest sympathy.

G. MURRAY.

ZALEUKOS AND CHARONDAS.

Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas.

By MAX MÜHL. Pp. 52. Reprinted from *Klio*, vol. 22. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929. Paper, RM. 2.

OUR knowledge of Zaleukos and Charondas and their codes rests mainly on incidental allusions in writers of the fourth century, and a more consecutive account in Diodorus. Unfortunately,

as Dr. Mühl reminds us, between the period of our lawgivers and that of our earliest sources come the laws of Thurii, inspired largely by these early *nomothetai*, while between the fourth century and Diodorus comes the Hellenistic age with its rich growth of pseudo-history written to enforce the moral teaching of the period. The resultant contaminations have led to such confusions and

uncertainty that already in the third century B. C. Timaeus denied the existence of Zaleukos, while quite recently Beloch has explained away both lawgivers as gods.

This monograph is an effective reply to such ultra-sceptical views. It examines in detail all the measures ascribed to the two lawgivers, and tests them by what we know of other early laws, of legislation of the Thurii period, and of the influences that caused contaminations during the Hellenistic age. The conclusion reached by this examination is that our fourth century sources are in the main trustworthy as far as they go and that even Diodorus contains some authentic information embedded in later accretions.

For Zaleukos Mühl accepts as authentic the law that claims an eye for an eye (two eyes for one if the victim was one-eyed is a later refinement); the penalty of death by hanging for an unsuccessful proposal to change an existing law; fixed penalties determined not by judges but by the law itself; laws relating to contracts; a law determining which party shall hold disputed property pending the judgment of the court; laws regulating women's dress and behaviour; and an injunction to absolute obedience to the laws, good or bad, so long as they remained in force (so also Charondas).

Laws of Charondas which he accepts as genuine deal with false witness, incendiarism, damage to property, buying and selling, divorce, orphans, heiresses, military service, and keeping bad company.

A general view of these somewhat miscellaneous enactments and a comparison with other early laws lead Mühl to the conclusion that our legislators sought to regulate the whole life, private and public, of their fellow-citizens: their aim was to educate, not merely to punish, and where they changed existing penalties it was to make them milder. Death was reserved for offences against the state; the eye for eye principle was modified in such a way that though the punishment still fitted the crime it now sometimes did so in a symbolic or purely educative sense: the man who had shown cowardice, for instance, was no longer put to

death; instead, he was exposed to public derision dressed as a woman. If a woman dressed immodestly she might be violated with impunity. This ingenious reference to the *lex talionis* enables Mühl to claim some measures as authentic which have commonly been regarded as fanciful inventions of a later age. He is inclined too to accept the assertion that Charondas' laws were put to music and performed on prescribed occasions.

Mühl's monograph was written before the appearance of Adcock's interesting but less detailed paper on early Greek code-makers (*Cambridge Historical Journal*, 1927), which agrees in distinguishing between an earlier and a secondary tradition and in giving a general acceptance to the earlier. In the later, Diodoran, account Adcock sees mainly the influence of Hermippus (a pupil of Callimachus who wrote a *περὶ νομοθετῶν*) where Mühl, following Busolt, sees that of Posidonius. On this point Adcock's view has much to recommend it; but where he differs from Mühl in rejecting individual items of evidence Mühl's cautious acceptances seem generally to be based on more solid grounds.

There are two points on which Mühl himself perhaps treats his authorities with insufficient respect. Aristotle's statement (*Pol.* 1297a. 23) that Charondas fined the rich heavily, the poor lightly, *ἀν μὴ δικάζωσι*, is rejected by Mühl on the ground that such a measure implies a democracy, whereas Aristotle himself tells us (*Pol.* 1297a. 34 f. cp. 1316a. 38, see Mühl pp. 11-12) that Charondas legislated for an oligarchy. But if we read the one statement in the light of the other and explain the *ἄποροι* as those numerous members of the ruling aristocracy who had lost both their private fortunes and their public spirit, the measure becomes an interesting illustration of Charondas' belief (so well brought out by Mühl himself) that people can be made good by act of parliament.

The other statement which Mühl may have been a little hasty in rejecting comes from Diodorus, and is to the effect that Charondas provided free compulsory schooling in the art of writing.

True, the word *χορηγεῖν* suits better the period of Thuri and Protagoras, and we have no other evidence for any such measure in the sixth century. But the anachronism in *χορηγεῖν* may be purely verbal, and we do know that writing was becoming in the sixth century a common (and doubtless much prized) accomplishment. Ernest Gardner re-

cords more than 700 incised inscriptions on archaic vases from Naukratis; it is the period above all others when we find them on the pottery at Mykalessos. The author of one of the earliest written codes might well take measures that his code should be read.

The final section of this useful study deals with the lawgivers' lives and dates.
P. N. URE.

GREEK LOVE POEMS.

Some Greek Love Poems. Gathered and translated, with a brief account of Greek love poetry, by J. M. EDMONDS. Pp. xii+94; 3 tinted cuts by Vera Willoughby. London: Peter Davies, 1929. £2 10s.

THIS is a beautiful gift-book, exquisitely printed, with decorations few but apposite. Considering the translations correspond page for page with the Greek, it is difficult to see why they have been put all together at the end instead of facing the originals. The reader will do his possession no good while he turns backward and forward to compare version and text.

The Greek 'Antigone' type, designed by J. van Krimpen, appears here for the first time in a new size—on a sixteen-point body; on a twelve-point body it was used last year in Mr. Edmonds' *Sappho Revocata*. On the subject of modern attempts at fine Greek printing, I am glad to have this opportunity of referring to an article by Mr. T. D. Barlow (in the form of a review of Scholderer's *Greek Printing Types*, 1465-1927) in *The Library*, fourth series, Vol. VIII. (1928), p. 361, which seems to me to contain the soundest sense I have seen of late years. This 'Antigone' type is in the right tradition. (In less ambitious spheres I must give a word of praise to the Greek lately adopted by *The Times* newspaper in its daily issue as well as in the *Literary Supplement*.)

After a rather dry little introduction Mr. Edmonds gets to work with his selection. He represents by short pieces or extracts Minnermus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Theognis (for whom four pieces seems rather a liberal allowance, while the same quantity is

not excessive for Theocritus), Moschus, Bion, and about a dozen contributors to the *Anthology*. It is a good choice for so short a book, and Mr. Edmonds has taken trouble to give us as good texts as may be. He has wisely avoided poems requiring an inordinate amount of conjectural restoration. As for his translation, I have the feeling that he is most successful with those that are slightly archaic in character. I may instance the two little pieces of Sappho and Alcaeus (the famous *δέδουκε μὲν ἃ σέλαννα* and the Address to Sappho), which he renders:

1. The Moon is gone
And the Pleiads set,
Midnight is nigh;
Time passes on,
And passes; yet
Alone I lie.
2. Sappho of the violet tresses,
Gently smiling, pure as day;
There's something that my heart confesses,
But shame takes my speech away.

These seem to me good. When he comes to poets more modern in sentiment or diction he fails by being a little 'difficult,' when something slick and tripping is needed. Take for instance one of the two epigrams by Strato (*Anth. Pal.* XII. 235):

*εἰ μὲν γηράσκει τὸ καλόν, μετάδος πρὶν ἀπέλθῃ·
εἰ δὲ μένει, τί φοβῆ τοῦθ' ὃ μένει διδόναι;*

These are *vers de société un peu légers*, of a kind which might be found in Martial or Herrick, and should be translated into language understood of the frivolous of all ages; but Mr. Edmonds writes:

If ev'ry fair comes to decay,
Quick, give me of that fair of thine;
But if thy fair be thine for aye,
Why fear'st to let me make it mine?

which has to be read through several times before you can see what it is all about. I wish he would try, as he half

promises us, the *Anacreontea* and some other later poems, and seek an easier, lower style in which to render them.

S. GASELEE.

GREEK LYRIC METRE.

Greek Lyric Metre. By GEORGE THOMSON, M.A. Pp. 164. Cambridge University Press, 1929. 12s. 6d. net.

HEADLAM's theories, published in 1902, have at last been publicly investigated. Mr. Thomson begins by stating the difference between 'rhythmic' and metric, and admirably describes the technique whereby rhythmical figures are mobilised into stanzas, discovering many beautiful rhythmic effects (*cf.* especially pp. 30, 107-9, 113). The next step is to show that the strophe tends to assume forms common in modern music (A-B-A, etc.), after which 'significant rhythm' (Headlam's *leitmotiv*) is investigated. In the light of this, continuous lyrical composition (Pind. *Ol.* I. and the lyric parts of Aesch. *Supp.* and *Oresteia*) is examined, the successive rhythmical figures being explained by reference either to the sense or to musical form. The author's method justifies itself: there are disclosed many happy instances of the use of appropriate rhythms—'reminiscent' rhythms (pp. 32, 47, 69, 78, 103), expressive rhythms (107-9, 113); but among much that is valuable there is much that is arbitrary and doubtful.

'Musical form' is pressed too hard. Mr. Thomson admits that it is not to be found everywhere: Aesch. *Supp.* 104 ff. (p. 87) is plain ABC. Is it not, then, unnecessary to take *Supp.* 88 ff. as Dorian A-B by making (μελαίνα) ξὺν τύχα μερόπεςσι λαοῖς epitrites, when Aeolian is so commonly used by Aeschylus as a final cadence? Is not εὐλόγως, Ἐπαφόν τ' ἐγέννασε (*ibid.* 47) (p. 84) more comfortable as a protracted Pherecratic cadence than as epitrites? Aesch. *Cho.* 779-84 (p. 128) should surely, on the author's principles, read

διὰ δίκας πᾶν ἔπος

4th paeon + Cretic.

ἐλακον, ὦ Ζεῦ, σύ νυν φυλάσσεις.

4th paeon + Cretic. Dochmiac.

The 'form' of Pindar *Nem.* VII. (p. 43)

neglects the Paeonic in A. This zeal for simple form appears too in Mr. Sheppard's cyclic scheme of choral odes, adopted by Mr. Thomson, which seems to depend too much on the ability to find what you look for.

In other cases the author pursues the shadow rather than the substance. The form A-B-A surely implies some change of mood and some reasonable proportion between A and B. Now, as Mr. Thomson says (p. 91, note 2), the Aeolian tripody (-υυ-υ-) is a common variant for the dochmiac: therefore in *Supp.* 352 (p. 90) ἴδε με τὰν ἱκέτιν does not interfere with the dochmiac quality of its context, and should not be hailed as B and made to balance the three Aeolian figures which end the strophe. In the very next strophe we find 9 dochmiacs, 1 prosodiac and 1 dochmiac labelled A-B-A! πᾶν ἐπικραίνεις is not a new subject B, but a passing inference, designed to emphasise the words.¹ The most remarkable feature of this strophe is obliterated, in spite of the clear word-division—the emphatic and suggestive rhythm κρατύνεις βῶμον, μονοψήφοισι, μονοσκήπτροισι.

The general ethical effect of the Dorian and other rhythms and their effective use by way of passing allusion are fully demonstrated, but again Mr. Thomson appears to systematise too much. Aeolian was used so freely that 'Aeolian for Athens' has no great significance.² Dorian is appropriately used when Dorian gods are being discussed, but to suggest that two verses of the Dorian passage *Ajax* 172-91 are Dorian because Artemis, Zeus and Apollo are mentioned is to lose sight of the dramatic reasons for the rhythm;

¹ Cf. Brahms' habit of altering his time-signature for one or two bars before the close. No change of mood is implied.

² I feel that Headlam's term *leitmotiv* is unfortunate. It means a phrase invented for and restricted to one idea; these rhythmical figures cannot be that.

and surely Ionic prevails in the *Bacchae* because of the temper of the play and not because Dionysus came from Asia? But it is in 'choriambic for prophecy' that the advance from ethical character to particular significance seems most hazardous. In the first of the five examples (*O.T.* 483) the whole strophe is in choriambic or the kindred Ionic a minore, the reason for which is not the prophecy but the excitement of the chorus. In the second (*Supp.* 58) the *οἰωνοπόλος* is not particularly prophetic: in the fifth (*O.T.* 1086) we have only 'an initial prosodiac which suggests choriambic.' The fourth (*Soph. El.* 473-4) raises a more important question. It is in a rhythm common enough in Sophocles (*O.C.* 510, *Phil.* 175, 202, 707, etc.). Mr. Thomson prints it

εἰ μὴ 'γὰρ παράφρων μάντις ἔφυν
καὶ γνώμας λειπομένα σοφᾶς.¹

For *O.C.* 694 (p. 65) we have—

ἔστιν δ' οἶον ἐγὼ γὰρ Ἀσίας οὐκ ἐπακούω.

Pherecratic.

Ionic a minore.

For *Antig.* 944 (p. 52) we find—

ἔτλα καὶ Δανάας οὐράνιον φῶς, etc.,

Prosodiacs.

which is obviously the natural rhythm of all these passages. Mr. Thomson reasonably postulates some assistance from the music in defining the rhythm,

but surely not to the contradiction of the natural flow of the words.

To interject a possibly constructive criticism: would it not be better to withhold the title Prosodiac from certain dactylic passages (e.g. *Cho.* 379-81, 393-4; p. 50) which, having no admixture of epitrites, lack the 'Handelian' ring of Dorian, and are used on non-Dorian subjects (as for flight in *Supp.* 554, where the effect of the 'prosodiacs' and choriambics is nearly the same)?

Mr. Thomson gives two striking examples of real *leitmotiv* in the trochaic rhythm of the *Supplices* (p. 99) and the 4th paeon in the *Oresteia* (pp. 117-8), but the significance of -οοοο- in *Soph. Electra* seems doubtful.²

The summary of *Alcestis* contains some interesting remarks about the later developments: that of Aesch. *P.V.* gives an excellent example of the significant change of rhythm; that of *Antigone* makes me sorry that I have no space for more captiousness. It raises the question: 'When is a dochmiac not a dochmiac?' Not, I think, when it occurs in the common cadence of *ἰππείῳ γένει πολεύων*. We are dealing with imponderabilia: Mr. Thomson hears a steady Paeonic development; my ear, when the 'climax' comes, is almost as much surprised as Creon himself.

H. D. F. KITTO.

¹ I take καὶ as a link, and γνώμας λ. σ. as a glyconic, echoing εἰ μὴ 'γὰρ π.

² For in vv. 207 and 227 there is no suggestion of Orestes, and the explanation of vv. 504-515 is not very convincing.

PINDAR'S ODES OF VICTORY.

Πινδάρου Ἐπινίκια: *Pindar's Odes of Victory*. The Olympian and Pythian Odes, with an Introduction and a Translation into English Verse by C. J. BILLSON: embellished with wood-engravings by JOHN FARLEIGH. Pp. xxii + 297. Oxford: Blackwell, 1928. £3 13s. 6d.

THIS is a charming book. The Shakespeare Head Press of Stratford-upon-Avon has provided it with admirable paper, type, and printing. There is no critical apparatus, but this simplification suits the purpose of the book, and the text is sensible, though old-fashioned:

it mostly follows Boeckh, and he is no bad guide. There seem to be no blunders or slips in the Greek. The verse translation is good. It would, of course, be easy to dispute the interpretation of many passages, and much subtlety is inevitably lost: but, though the true sense is sometimes missed, the meaning is on the whole truthfully conveyed in dignified and unaffected language. Mr. Billson often succeeds to a surprising degree in conveying to the English reader some impression of the sweep and grandeur of the Greek.

The Introduction gives a slight but

agreeable account of the Olympian and Pythian games, with a sketch of their racial and religious background obviously inspired by 'The Early Age of Greece' and 'Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.' There are one or two slips in dating: for example, the temple of Delphi was burnt in 548, not in 568 (p. xix), and 502 on p. v should be 498. This last error is probably a relic of the false Pythian dating, but elsewhere the Pythian dates are correct, though it is a pity that the Eighth Pythian is not assigned, with the Scholiast, to 446.

Mr. Farleigh's woodcuts are very curious. The majority are inspired by black and red figure vase-paintings—

on p. 295, for instance, there is a close adaptation of the Pan Painter's Perseus—and in these the coarsening of line inevitable to the medium is irritating, and there is often a pointless addition or exaggeration of grotesqueness. Others, again, are quite modern in conception, with landscape and perspective, and these do not harmonize with the rest. Yet the general effect as decoration is undeniably pleasing: as woodcuts they are strong and simple, and they look very well on the page. The Odes could scarcely be read in a more satisfactory setting, and the whole production has a restrained splendour and amplitude which Pindar himself would have appreciated.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

ARCHITECTURE.

A Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture. By D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge. Pp. xxiv+406, 24 photographic plates and 135 text figures. Cambridge: University Press, 1929. 25s. net.

THIS is a sound and readable account of classical architecture, and it is especially valuable to English students as it draws largely on the work of foreign scholars. The illustrations are fresh, and many are from sources which are only available in a large library. For example, we are given the restoration of the Corinthian capital at Tegea, which was only published a few years ago. A simply invaluable bibliography forms one appendix; another is a very full chronological table with notes on each building; a third is a glossary of terms, which as it comes from a literary expert is most welcome. Town-planning, civic and domestic buildings are considered as well as temples, and a section deals with the often neglected building art of the Etruscans. The wish may be expressed that the demand for this excellent volume may be so large that it can be brought up to date from time to time like a year-book.

It would be vain in a short notice to attempt to discuss particular interpretations of evidence or datings, and here only a few general questions can be

mentioned. The views expressed on the much-debated adjustments by curvature and inclination in Greek buildings are cautious and trustworthy. These subtle modifications of the straight and the level may have arisen in the practical needs of building, even though in later times they were thought to be aesthetic. 'The explanation of these refinements is far from easy. Vitruvius' masters, probably Ionic architects of the fourth century B.C., believed their purpose to be the correction of optical illusions: without them the stylobate would seem to sag, the entablature would seem to recede, the angle columns would look thin against the sky. Ictinus wrote a book on the Parthenon, and the optical theory may well be as old as the fifth century; but it does not follow that it is true. . . . It is likely that the different refinements have different ultimate origins: the curvature of the stylobate was perhaps for drainage, the tilting of walls and columns and the thickening of the angle columns for strength, entasis for beauty. . . . To him who sees the Parthenon, even as it stands to-day, the elasticity and life which spring from these unnoticed subtleties is a revelation. It matters little if their ultimate secret was hidden from Ictinus.' We are pretty safe under the direction of one who can see the 'elasticity and life' of a great

Greek work and yet recognise doubts of aesthetic theories.

Again, on that large and vague matter 'proportion,' the guidance is equally sound. The system followed at Priene comes to little more than the use of round numbers of Greek feet. 'At Magnesia all the chief interaxial measurements are multiples of four feet and most are multiples of twelve feet.' Such a liking for simple round measurements is something different from the complex systems of ratios, the exposition of which has filled so many learned volumes. The Great Pyramid seems to have been set out in this way, and in the Book of Genesis the dimensions of the Ark are given according to much the same system.

In a few passages which express artistic judgment or 'taste' the author seems to be equally sound and suggestive. The Ionic architecture of the fourth century displayed 'showy brilliance early touched by emptiness and vulgarity. . . . It is difficult to judge of the original appearance of these great fourth-century buildings. Their magnificence is indisputable, but it seems likely that, with the possible exception of Ephesus, they lacked freshness and interest. In those of the following centuries we can feel the definite beginnings of ostentation and vulgarity, though they often maintain a very high level of technical excellence.' These wise words show an

insight and independent confidence to which we are hardly accustomed. They are especially important as applicable to the theory of building or the architectural question in modern society. There is a very great danger lest 'architecture' be always thought of as an art of ostentation rather than of sweetness and light. It may be hoped that this stimulating volume will lead many more University students along these pleasant paths. We especially require full studies of the great monuments with which British explorers were closely identified in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In regard to these monuments in which we are particularly interested two little points may be mentioned, one in agreement, the other in doubt. It is remarked of the Mausoleum: 'The huge pointed arch in the basis, shown in a recent restoration, seems quite incredible.' Of the Parthenon we are told that in the secondary chamber were 'four large columns, probably Ionic'; the plan given seems to indicate them as being Doric—that is, of similar diameter to the inner columns of the fronts. From the point of view of reference to examples close at hand, it may be pointed out that the big caryatid fragment from Eleusis in the Fitzwilliam Museum does not seem to be described, and English museums do not appear in the index.

W. R. LETHABY.

GREEK COSMOPOLITANISM.

Die antike Menschheitsidee in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Von MAX MÜHL. (Das Erbe der Alten, Zweite Reihe, Heft XIV.) Pp. xii. + 144. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1928. Paper, Rm. 6.50; board, Rm. 8.

To trace the expansion of human sympathies, the gradual realisation of unity, fellowship, and duty beyond all barriers of blood, speech, or political convention to the limits of mankind, to mark the attendant changes of attitude to slavery and war, and to relate this progress and occasional backsliding of thought and feeling to the outward events of history, political, social, and economic, is a

work whose interest needs no commending to our generation. Dr. Mühl has done it admirably and for the first time, if we except incidental references in histories of ethics and such discussions of detail as Jüthner's *Hellenen und Barbaren*, Reitzenstein's *Werden und Wesen der Humanität im Altertum*, and Mewaldt's *Das Welbürgertum in der Antike* (*Die Antike* II. 3, pp. 177 ff.). That the East has contributed and the evidence surviving thence deserves examination is not forgotten, but Dr. Mühl reasonably limits his inquiry to the Greek and Roman worlds. He has traversed the classical literatures

with a sure and penetrating eye, has analysed justly what he has seen, and has presented facts and conclusions¹ clearly and vividly, wasting no words. Evidence is sometimes quoted directly in the text, but usually is reserved in full, or under adequate references, to the notes at the close. There is a brief index of classical names.

In a work of such scope flaws of detail and omissions are almost inevitable. Beginning with the doubtful statement that in the times about which no literature brings us information the question at issue was not raised, Dr. Mühl proceeds to imply that the Homeric poems are the product of an age of voyaging and trade which made the boundaries of the City-State seem too narrow. The selfish economic basis of the resultant *Weltmenschen* he contrasts with the lofty ethics of philosophic cosmopolitanism, but says nothing of the religious background of the earlier phase and the attitude there to strangers and slaves. He does justice to Heraclitus' conception of the divine law behind all human laws, but fails to mention his keen sense of human inequality or his support of πόλεμος and ἔρις, though presently he notes the Empedoclean and Pythagorean teachings on the latter subject. The positive gain of the Sophistic 'enlightenment'—e.g., that slavery is a man-made institution—is well urged, but without corresponding notice of the darker side, the 'Might is Right' gospel of Thrasymachus and Callicles and of Athens in the Melian Dialogue. He discusses the relatively reactionary and nationalist tendencies of Socrates and Plato, and notes the discrimination against 'barbarians' generally in *Republic* V. 470, but misses *Meno* 82 with its implications for the humanity of slaves and the recognition of racial differences of character in *Republic* IV. 435-6 and *Timaeus* 22B. To the Stoic picture of

the state (as to that of Plato) he objects (p. 47) that it is rigid, static, and eliminates history, but this is scarcely valid criticism of an ideal, and it ignores the doctrine of προκοπή applied to states² as to individuals. It is right to stress the religious side of Posidonius' contribution, but scarcely fair to the older Stoa to say that 'it was dominated fundamentally by an irreligious rationalism' (p. 68).

Dr. Mühl does not merely review the development of thought; he passes judgment upon it. The Stoic teaching which makes the service of mankind and the whole world a higher aim he compares adversely to Cicero's championing of the local state. Dr. Mühl is a patriot, and one is tempted to quote his own comment upon a saying of Plutarch: 'Hier redet eben die Sprache des Herzens, nicht der Geist des Philosophen.' The interests of all mankind must take precedence over those of any nation. This need not mean, as Dr. Mühl appears to think, that a nation, any more than a man, must sacrifice its individuality or lose its peculiar gifts.

The merits of the book remain. These criticisms of detail do no justice to the panoramic continuity of the picture drawn for us or the interest of the points treated by the way: the union of individualism and cosmopolitanism; the embodiment—and sometimes the lonely survival—in law of advances in thought, the consequences for thought of Alexander's conquests and of the rise and fall of the Roman 'world-state,' the merits and demerits of Christianity's contribution, replacing intellectual freedom by authority, intellectualist 'philanthropy' by the 'charity' of the heart, and the state real and ideal by the Church and a 'kingdom not of this world.' The philosopher, the historian, the student of politics, and all interested in ancient Greece and Rome will find here at once pleasure and profit.

R. B. ONIANS.

¹ A systematic summary will be found in R. Wagner's review, *Phil. Woch.*, January 12, 1929, col. 49 ff.

² See Stobaeus, *Ecl.* II. 186, p. 94 Wachsmuth.

PLATONISM.

Platonism. By JOHN BURNET, F.B.A.

Pp. 130. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1928. 9s.

THIS short book contains the text of lectures delivered in 1926 in the University of California. It is the last book Professor Burnet wrote. Those who are already familiar with the writings of the author and of Professor Taylor on the philosophy of Plato will not find here, especially in the earlier chapters, very much that is new. They may even feel a little disappointed that space could not be found for answers to some of the criticisms which have been passed on views which are here simply restated. No doubt the purpose and scope of the book excluded elaborate controversy. No one can fail to admire the skill, learning, and enthusiasm with which the lecturer once again gives life to his subject. Not all of his conclusions have won general acceptance: what is beyond controversy is the service he has rendered in making reader and hearer share his own conviction that each of the great philosophers of Greece was trying to solve the problems of his own day, and that each answer bequeathed a fresh problem to a succeeding philosopher.

The most interesting chapters are the last three, which discuss the doctrine of the later dialogues and whatever fragments can be pieced together of Plato's oral teaching in the Academy. Not the least interesting pages are those which glance at the later history of Platonism and Aristotelianism. 'It is of the first importance to realise that Plato's reluctance to express his real beliefs on certain subjects in writing, coupled with the fact that Aristotle had no such reluctance, accounts for the curious amalgam of the two doctrines which we call Neoplatonism' (p. III). Many readers will be led to regret anew their inadequate knowledge of the *Laws*. Perhaps some scholar may be found with the necessary equipment to follow up the problem stated in Chapter VI: if the Academy trained legislators, who followed in their work the guidance of Plato, how much of Plato's teaching

ultimately found its way through Hellenistic codes into Roman Law?

Chapter VII. hints at the developments in mathematics and in astronomy which can probably be traced to the Academy, and casts a stern eye on the reactionary views of Aristotle. But nothing is here done to suggest how these mathematical discoveries may have influenced Plato's metaphysics—a difficult but fascinating problem, as Professor Taylor's recent articles in *Mind* have shown.

Chapter VIII. is all too short. The new doctrine of the *Laws* about the soul and God is contrasted with the earlier discussions in the *Phaedo*. Reasoning has now replaced myth, and there is no word of the Forms. This, of course, does not of itself show that the doctrine of the *Phaedo* was not held by Plato. His thought did not stand still for forty years.

If we compare together different passages in the text it is difficult to be sure how far Professor Burnet meant to question or deny Plato's belief, at one period of his life, in the reality of Forms which he had not yet come to identify with Numbers.¹ But Aristotle's evidence, unsatisfactory as it is, seems to show that (whether or no Socrates ever gave the name εἶδη to his ὁρίσμοι) Plato at one time thought of εἶδη which were χωριστά (whatever that means) and were not ἀριθμοί.

The evidence of Aristotle is not satisfactorily treated. No direct reference is made to the two crucial passages in the *Metaphysics* (987a 29 and 1087b 9). And the statement that 'for the first ten years of Aristotle's membership of the Academy the direct influence of Plato upon him can only have been intermittent at best' seems to make too much of Plato's two short absences in Sicily. Surely throughout his twenty years in the Academy Aristotle had plenty of opportunity of comparing together Plato's oral teaching, the doctrine of the Dialogues, and preserved

¹ Cf. statements on p. 45 l. 9, p. 47 l. 13, p. 51 l. 10, p. 120 l. 21.

memories of Socrates. It may be said that Aristotle was an unsympathetic critic, or again that his report is ambiguous; but it surely cannot be denied that he had the means of judging.

The claim of the *Phaedo* to be treated as in the main historical is restated. It is a strong one, and does not seem to be absolutely refuted by any statement of Aristotle. But is it not a mistake to lay stress on the evidence of the *Clouds*? The view that Socrates ever gave secret instruction in a mixture of physical science, mathematics, and mystical religion receives no support from the

Phaedo and seems to be definitely disproved by plain statements of Socrates in the *Apology*. No doubt doctrines caricatured in the *Clouds* interested Socrates, though he soon found that they offered no solution of his own problem. They were well enough known in Athens for men to crack jokes about them; and Aristophanes kept the fun going by making that queer person Socrates teach them in his cellar.

There are some misprints, easily corrected, in the text; it is a pity that several references in the footnotes have gone wrong. P. W. DODD.

DEMOSTHENES' PROPERTY.

Demosthenes gegen Aphobos: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen Wirtschaft. By W. SCHWAHN. Pp. 46. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. RM. 3.

IN this brief and closely reasoned work Dr. Schwahn has set himself to unravel the tangled accounts of Demosthenes' paternal estate and to reconstruct the history of the firm 'from clogs to clogs.' As the author himself points out, the evidence in Demosthenes' speeches is incomplete and erratic—strangely enough, several of the orator's 'howlers' in arithmetic tell against his own case; hence a complete elucidation of the problem is no longer possible. Yet anyone who follows out Dr. Schwahn's calculations will find that he has convincingly cleared up all the important items. *Exempli gratia*, we would single out his calculations on the normal output and the labour costs (c. 25 per cent.) of the knife factory (pp. 30-31); his elegant and cogent proof of the accumulation of finished goods value 93 minae at the death of Demosthenes' father (pp. 16-18); his explanation of the *locus desperatus* in § 9 of the first speech, where he corrects Blass' punctuation as follows: *μαχαίροποιούς μὲν τριάκοντα, καὶ δὲ ἡ τρεῖς ἀνὰ πέντε μνᾶς καὶ ἕξ, τοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐλάττους ἢ τριῶν μνῶν ἀξιούς* (pp. 15-16).

The main conclusions from Dr. Schwahn's analysis are (1) that Demosthenes' guardians were undoubtedly dishonest and incompetent; (2) that, while the technical processes of an Athenian factory might be efficiently supervised by a slave, its commercial

management required the personal care and skill of the owner or trustee.

A few notes and queries may be appended.

P. 6, n. 9.—The reference should be to 2, 5 (not 2, 7).

P. 8.—In summing up the items received (and acknowledged) by the trustees, Dr. Schwahn mentions 1 talent 'aus dem Fabrikbetriebe.' This expression requires explanation. It does not refer to the realised profits (for which Dr. Schwahn has a separate entry), but to unpaid debts of customers.

P. 11.—Dr. Schwahn calculates that 150 minae of raw materials, if used up at the rate of 4 minae per mensem, would last 82½ months. Is this not rather optimistic?

P. 37.—Though we may readily accept Dr. Schwahn's shrewd conjecture that part of the raw materials acquired by the elder Demosthenes were intended for re-sale, can we safely assume that the firm made a regular annual profit (of 27 minae, or of any other sum) out of such transactions? These sales might have been no more than an occasional adjunct to the manufacturing business, contingent upon the snapping up of a good bargain in the wholesale market.

But these slips do not impair the very real value of Dr. Schwahn's book. Spade-work of the kind which he has successfully accomplished is what is now most needed in the study of ancient economics.

M. CARY.

ALEXANDER IN INDIA.

On Alexander's Track to the Indus. By SIR AUREL STEIN, K.C.I.E. Pp. xvi+182; 97 photographs and two maps. London: Macmillan and Co., 1929. 21s.

EVEN without Aornos this would be a fascinating book. Sir A. Stein is the first European to explore Northern Swāt; that he would make excellent use of the opportunity goes without saying. His book, which contains some beautiful photographs, is full of interesting things: many Buddhist remains, including a large stupa at Birkot in wonderful preservation; confirmation of various details noted by Hsüan-Tsang; the presence in many places of Indo-Greek coins, and the employment to-day of Hellenistic motives by local wood-carvers, which show that Swāt was a Hellenistic 'Garden' before it became a Buddhist one; the acquisition for philology of new dialects. But the main purpose of the explorer was to follow Alexander's campaign from the crossing of the Swāt river; just two places, Massaga and Dyrtā, are not identified, but he would place Dyrtā in Buner. The main matters—the identification of Ora and Bazira with Udegram and Birkot, and the details of the principal discovery, Aornos—have been already published in the *Geographical Journal* for 1927, and reprinted as *Alexander's Campaign on the Indian North-West Frontier*, which I noticed in this *Review* (XLII., 1928, p. 50 ff.). I mentioned there, as I was bound to do, certain difficulties which arose in comparing Stein's discovery with Arrian; but I think now it is possible to explain them, thanks to some new information and above all to Stein's new and most valuable map of the Aornos position; we must discard Claudius Ptolemy's location of Embo-lima, but this offers little objection if other things fit. The Aornos position was shaped like an inverted capital L, with two ridges, Una-sar and Pir-sar, meeting at right angles in the rocky cone Bar-sar; if we suppose that Arrian used the term 'rock' to mean the whole L we get rid of the difficulties I indi-

cated in its use and also (as Stein notes) can explain the large circumference given to Aornos. It was also a difficulty that, philologically, Aornos = Una (Unra), for Una was not the stronghold; a new fact given on p. 152—the name Una is applied not only to the peak but to the whole massif—meets this point. Next, the difficulty that Alexander sent away his best troops under Ptolemy on a useless errand *before* he attacked the first day now vanishes; Stein's text does not treat the first day's plan, but the new map shows what happened. The 'road' up which Alexander made this first attack must be that by the Pezal-Kandao pass, 4620, towards Maju; his first plan therefore was to seize the south end of the Pir-sar ridge, signal to Ptolemy on Little Una, and then make a converging attack on Bar-sar, himself along the Pir-sar ridge and Ptolemy along Una-sar (he cannot have yet known of the Burimar ravine); but he failed to force pass 4620, so he had to adopt another plan. As to this plan (the 2nd day), if we treat some small discrepancies as inevitable, only one real trouble now remains: why does Arrian (? Ptolemy) not mention the (Burimar) ravine, the crux of the whole operation? Well, why does Polybius not describe the Achaean constitution? I daresay others beside myself have had the experience that in writing something you may happen to omit the most important point just because your mind is so full of it that you never notice (until you revise) that you have not written it down; even so perhaps Arrian, his mind full of the ramp across the ravine, never noticed that he had not mentioned a ravine. At any rate, I myself now gratefully accept Stein's brilliant discovery. I should like to see some military engineer work out Arrian's details about the building of the ramp in relation to the ground and man-power; the *width* of the ravine, 500 yards, is now added to the previous description, and experiment has shown the range of catapults, but unfortunately we do not know how many axes per 100

men a Macedonian army carried. Lastly, this book brings out splendidly the astounding nature of the military operations in Swāt and the consequent

terror Alexander inspired. Small wonder if some thought him more than man.

W. W. TARN.

MORE NEW CHAPTERS IN GREEK LITERATURE.

New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Second Series. Some recent discoveries in Greek poetry and prose, chiefly of the fourth century B.C. and later times. Edited by J. U. POWELL and E. A. BARBER. Pp. 232. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929. Cloth, 15s. net.

AFTER the warm welcome given to their first volume, Mr. Powell and Mr. Barber are amply justified in producing a second, describing the additions made in recent years to Greek, or rather to Alexandrian, literature. A thorough survey of new discoveries concerns not only the classical public, but even professional scholars, who may too easily miss publications in inaccessible periodicals, and can only be grateful for the collection of such a wealth of material as there is here. The editors have, as before, deputed much of their work to other skilled hands and have allowed their contributors to treat their subjects as they will. The result is a pleasing variety. While Mr. Murray's article on Menander may be read by those who have little or no Greek, Mr. Edwards and Mr. Mountford make their appeal more strictly to scholars.

At the outset let it be freely admitted that this volume is less interesting than its predecessor. For this the editors are not to blame, unless it be for restricting the scope of their subject to the Alexandrian age. In recent years Egypt has produced hardly any papyrus of the first literary importance, and we must be content with what we have got. There is much here of interest for the student of Greek literature, but it belongs to the tributaries and not to the main stream. By far the most important discovery here described is the fragment of the Prologue to Callimachus' *Αἴτια*. This is well discussed by Mr. Barber. He does not say much, but what he says is very competent and instructive.

In a very few pages he tells us all that is known of the piece and leaves us anxious for more of it to appear, if only to see whether he is right in estimating so highly Ovid's debt to Callimachus.

In the other chapters the chief difficulty before the writers has been to co-ordinate into a whole the heterogeneous and fragmentary material before them. To impose unity on such a chaos and to make it interesting requires gifts of a high order, and their successful use is well shown by Mr. Edwards and Mr. Edgar. Mr. Edwards' task was one of peculiar difficulty. He had to describe the fragments of *διάλογοι*, *διατριβαί* and *μελέται*, all the remnants of that prose literature on which the Alexandrians expended their intelligence. But through this labyrinth Mr. Edwards picks his way easily and takes us with him. His method is to choose outstanding examples of this type of writing and then to explain them in their historical context with an array of apt allusion and illustration. His account of the 'Trial of Demades' is an excellent example of how to treat such material, and in these pages the amusing, if unrepentant, blackguard lives again. On points of language Mr. Edwards is thoroughly at home, and he skilfully shows where the Alexandrians slip in their imitation of Attic. His quotations are well chosen and to the point. Even in the dreary collections of apophthegms he has found a gem, *λέγε μὲν τὰ ἥδιστα, πρῶσσε δὲ τὰ συμφέροντα*.

Mr. Edgar's task was easier, and it has been conducted with equal success. Ancient letters, even if lacking all literary pretensions, are always interesting as human records. From the enormous mass of available papyri Mr. Edgar has chosen many that will charm or amuse, and we are introduced to the everyday affairs of farmers, merchants, and schoolboys. He ends with some

admirable remarks on the connexion between the language of these letters and the *κοινή* of the New Testament. Here *ψωμίον*, the 'sop' of Judas Iscariot, is used of the food given by sightseers to crocodiles, and the cry *ἄρον αὐτόν*, 'Away with him!' is used by a mother of her tiresome son.

The most masterly chapter in the book is Mr. Mountford's on 'Greek Music in the Papyri.' The title is modest and indeed deceptive. For Mr. Mountford surveys all the known fragments of Greek music and pronounces authoritative judgment on their date and interpretation. There is nothing in English to compare with his chapter either in fullness or in conciseness. He describes in detail all the known fragments of Greek music, considers the notation, and presents us with transcripts of all the pieces—all in the short space of thirty-seven pages. The chapter is well documented and shows an admirable caution about coming to conclusions where the evidence is too scanty or too obscure. It will be long before it is superseded.

To some readers Mr. Murray's chapter on Menander will come with a shock of surprise. Recent years have seen such improvements on Menander's text that a new estimate of him is well justified here, and this estimate is made with all the resources of Mr. Murray's trained imagination. Some of us are liable to regard Menander as a gentle, disillusioned man with a good style and a taste for the *demi-monde*. Mr. Murray controverts this common heresy. He finds in Menander 'an infinite belief in patience, affection, and sympathy.' Nor must he be blamed for his plots. They were forced on him by his time and the traditions of his art. The monotonous foundling, who so seldom stirs our hearts, 'is merely a humanised form of the Divine Year Baby.' And the scenes of nocturnal orgy, so sadly degraded by Plautus and Terence, have also their ritual origin. They are the descendants of the communal marriage feast, 'where in the wild emotion of the midnight dances in wood and on mountain many an excited girl met her ravisher.' All this is highly suggestive and sends us back to Menander with heightened

curiosity. To some perhaps Mr. Murray will appear *ψεύδος ἡλικὸν μετέπων*. Yet antiquity thought better of Menander than we do, and let us hope that Mr. Murray has helped us to understand that estimate.

With a conscientiousness too rare in editors Mr. Powell has kept the most difficult work for himself. To review the fragments of minor Alexandrian poetry is neither an easy nor an agreeable task, and at times Mr. Powell may be suspected of a slight lack of enthusiasm. But to this somewhat thankless duty he brings a wealth of learning, which he carries so lightly that it is always charming. His way is to take an aspect of his subject and to unravel its history from its origins. Thus the fragments of minor epics provide him with a starting-point for an excellent display of learning on *ἀγωνισμοί* and *ἐπιδείξεις* and the part they played in Greek poetry. Characters otherwise unknown he makes interesting by a short anecdote or a sketch of personal characteristics. In his account of new epigrams he has material more to his taste, and the chapter is full of good things. He quotes at least three epigrams (p. 52) with a real echo of Simonidean grace, and others of less distinction, like that on an Aristarchus killed in the Gaulish invasions, show that the Alexandrians could still write in the great manner. If we must find fault with Mr. Powell, it is that he is too modest. He is content with quoting the opinions of others when his own would be better. He shyly hides himself behind recognised authorities, and seems nervous of committing himself too far. Yet when he does commit himself, his mature judgment and sensitiveness are worth more than his quotations from others.

In the form of an appendix Mr. Powell gives us a chapter on 'Recent Accessions to the Poetry of the Hesiodic School.' No branch of scholarship needs more attention than this, and it is a pity that limitations of space have prevented Mr. Powell from elaborating his views. He can only review the new fragments, describe the general character of Boeotian poetry, and suggest why such a poetry existed. He traces back Boeotian civilisation to a Minoan past

and seems to suggest that Hesiodic poetry owes something to this remote age. He skims lightly over the vexed question of the relation of the Boeotian to the Ionian epic, and he says little or

nothing on the date and authorship of the minor poems like the Shield of Heracles. Let us hope that he is now at work on these fascinating problems.

C. M. BOWRA.

A FRENCH EDITION OF THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY.

Anthologie Grecque. Première Partie, Anthologie Palatine. Tome I. (Livres I.-IV.); Tome II. (Livre V.). Texte établi et traduit par PIERRE WALTZ. (Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1928. Tome I., pp. lxxxvii + 135, 25 francs; Tome II., pp. 147, 25 francs.

THE Introduction to this edition of the *Greek Anthology* is marked by a complete grasp of the subject, lucidity of exposition, and sobriety of judgment, expressed in felicitous language. The reader will find presented here the best existing account of the history of the Greek Epigram, the stages in the growth of the *Anthology*, and the thorny textual problems which it contains, enriched with many new contributions to the text supplied by the editor and by M. Desrousseaux. M. Waltz has read and passes judgment upon everything which has been written on the subject of the Epigram in the Alexandrian, Roman, and Byzantine ages. He sums up the history of this branch of Greek poetry by observing that, although there are some outstanding writers, it exhibits not so much evolution, as imitation. Yet, he continues, although it is marked by 'une étroite et constante solidarité,' and generally speaking, 'un défaut de personnalité,' it displays a realism never surpassed by Comedy or Mime.

In spite of the minute investigations into the composition and stratification of the *Anthologia Palatina*, as we have it, few certain conclusions have been reached. What, for example, were the sources of Cephalas and the other compilers? What is the relation of the *Anthology* of Planudes to the Palatine? M. Waltz decides that, although Planudes had indisputably known and

used a copy of the *Anthology* of Cephalas and also other documents, he does not seem to have known the *Anthologia Palatina* which we possess.

Again, what is the value of the evidence which is provided by Suidas, or of that provided by the smaller *Συλλογαί*, which sometimes preserve valuable readings, and two of which were thought highly of by Meineke and Kaibel; while Sternbach was attracted, probably wrongly, by a third? Then there is the question of the different hands in the Palatine MS., which Stadtmueller was the first to report with exactness. On the relations of the hands called A and B, M. Desrousseaux offers some suggestions, observing that the most flagrant errors in the Palatine MS. occur at the beginning and end of lines rather than in the middle.

One naturally compares this edition with that of Stadtmueller. That edition, lamentably left unfinished, is a thesaurus of textual information, and a painstaking summary of the work which had been done up to his time; yet, even if he had lived to finish it, a succeeding editor of the text would have been necessary in order to separate the wheat from the chaff. The new text contains some new suggestions, some by the author, some by M. Desrousseaux: for instance, V. 27, 5, τραγεία (rather bold); 139, 6, πάντα πυρά· φλέγομαι; 238, 7, κάγκανος; 138, 3, οὐ δύσας 'sans renouveler les dix ans d'effort' (bold); but in V. 162, 3, ἔχιδναν must be right. The editor has unhesitatingly adopted some of Mr. Lumb's conjectures given in *Notes on the Greek Anthology*—e.g., V. 40, 8, ἡμάτιον, and V. 210, 1, τωθασμῶ; he might have adopted or mentioned other conjectures of that scholar, as I. 121, 11, ἀντὶ λογχῆς εἰσ' [= εἰσα] ὕδωρ, and his brilliant reconstruction of III. 10, 3

and 5, 'Οφέλτην and ἀφνεὸν οὐθαρ, and εἶα for ἄγε (transposition of letters) in III. 7, 5. Mention might also have been made of Wilamowitz' 'Ἀμύντα for ἄμεινον, V. 145, 5, and of Mr. Paton's οἶδα with Mr. Lumb's θιγῶν δὲ in V. 162, 4.

Hecker's οὐδὲ ἀντιάσαις in V. 23, 4 (= Callim. *Epigr.* 63) ought not to have been adopted, as Meineke gave warning; and in V. 211, 1, the syntax of τί μ' ἐγείρετε πρὶν πόδας ἄρω; is also illicit here. In V. 206, 8, the defence of οὐ κοτέουσα θύραις is not convincing. In V. 64, 4, M. Desrousseaux's διαδύς has been anticipated by Mr. Paton. In I. 34, 8, Agathias, οἶδε δὲ τέχνη | χρώμασι πορθμεῦσαι τὴν φρενὸς ἱκεσίην, ἱκεσίην is not a good word in view of φαντασίη in line 4. We may conjecture εἰκασίην, 'imaginem mente sua conceptam.' Agathias uses ἱκεσίην in V. 216, 2, whence it may have slipped into this Epigram.

Yet in spite of the merits mentioned above, the present reviewer has one criticism to make on the work as a whole. He has argued before in this *Review*, XXXI. 142, that the eighteenth-

century editors, Brunck and Jacobs, were wiser in assembling the poems of each author and editing these separately, and not *The Greek Anthology*. It still remains the merit of the editions of these scholars that their readers can study each author as a whole, and there is some sign that M. Waltz had the question before his mind. We can observe striking differences of tone and style in many of the Epigrammatists, in the same way as Meleager found, or thought he found, such differences between them as could be expressed by floral similitudes—and this is true of the later as well as of the earlier poets—but the reviewer must not repeat the arguments and illustrations which he gave in the article mentioned. Yet none the less scholars will await with eagerness the succeeding volumes of M. Waltz's edition which will contain some of the more difficult Epigrams, particularly those volumes which will take up the work at the point where Stadtmueller left it, and when it is completed it is likely ultimately to hold the field.

J. U. POWELL.

MANDAEANS AND CHRISTIANS.

Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe.

VON R. REITZENSTEIN, mit Beiträgen von L. TROJE. Pp. viii + 399. One full-page plate. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Paper, RM. 14; bound, 16.

THIS is a provocative book, likely to cause no little controversy and containing outspoken expressions of opinion and very clear definition of the author's views on disputed points. As to its worth, opinions differ and will continue to do so. The reviewer has heard one plain-spoken countryman of the author describe the whole method as *grundverfehlt*; on the other hand, there is enough learning and plausibility in all that Reitzenstein writes to win favour for theories much more extravagant than any of his. Moreover, he writes not simply as a student of religion but as a man having religious convictions of his own, and therefore with a sympathetic understanding of his subject. If this

were a journal devoted to theology or philosophy, a long review would be in place; as it is, I content myself with stating his theory and pointing out a few objections.

After the death of John the Baptist, his disciples continued to practise the ritual of their teacher and to maintain opposition to the Christians, who were growing daily more numerous and powerful. These Johannist sectaries were but one of several bodies, all practising baptism and all influenced by Persian ideas, which existed in the valley of the Jordan. Under such surroundings it is not surprising that they developed a ceremonial which combined baptism with a sacramental meal and was connected with a doctrine of a divine emissary, the last who should come before the end of the age, no other than John himself. The effect of the ritual upon those who took part in it was no mere purification from past sins,

but rather a sort of deification; they were mystically bathed in the celestial Jordan, the river of light, and fed with heavenly food.

Now the Christian ceremony of baptism, as practised by the early Church, was also more than a mere washing away of sins; it was explained as such only in relatively late times, when, to answer the puzzling question why it was applied to innocent children, the doctrine of original sin was developed, chiefly by St. Augustine. Earlier writers imply that to baptise was to evoke the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the neophyte, who thus became more than human, a *πνευματικός*. Upon baptism the Eucharist regularly followed. The Christian ritual and belief, then, strongly resembled the Johannine.

But the earliest and most authentic Christian tradition shows a close relation between John and Jesus, and also between their earliest disciples. It is therefore highly likely that the source of the Christian rite is not to be sought in Judaism, from which no satisfactory explanation can be drawn. Much likelier, indeed almost certain, is the Johannine origin of the practice and of the corresponding beliefs.

Evidence of what the Johannine ritual was is scanty if we look to early documents, the Gospels and Josephus. But in time the sect was driven or migrated eastwards, from the Jordan to the Euphrates, and there subsisted, isolated and dwindling, as the obscure body known as the Mandaean, whose ritual we possess. From this ritual, and from the various hymns which accompany it, we can reconstruct the ancient practice, which has never been unrecognisably changed. Furthermore, numerous passages in authors of various dates, from Philon onwards, show clear traces of

the existence of the same ideas and the same or similar rites which we find again in Mandaism.

Clearly the great difficulty is one of chronology. The Mandaean are first heard of, according to most accounts, in the eighth century; Reitzenstein produces evidence, not very cogent, for their existence in the fourth. Granting his claim, the fourth century is still a long way from the first, and the existence of a primitive Mandaean body on the banks of the Jordan is a hypothesis, a not unlikely one indeed, but still not a certain datum. Apart from these somewhat hypothetical Johannine-Mandaean sectaries, the supposed prototype of Christian baptism becomes an exceedingly nebulous thing. It can indeed be shown, and Reitzenstein shows it with his usual skill and acuteness, that similar ideas existed quite early; but that is not the same as the existence of such ideas embodied in a ritual which Christianity might know and, more or less consciously, copy. Space forbids the criticism of a number of details in which the reviewer feels that Reitzenstein is a little too apt to find theology (Persian for the most part) and ceremonial everywhere.

So much for the main theory of the book. In expounding it and producing evidence for it, the author has written much that will be new even to well-informed readers, and nothing which does not deserve consideration. It is a leading characteristic of men of his ability that their works are profitable, and incidentally most interesting, even to those who feel unable to accept their working hypotheses; and Reitzenstein claims no more for his suggestion than that it is a working hypothesis, capable of assisting investigation in this very difficult field.

H. J. ROSE.

ROMANUS LECAPENUS.

The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and his Reign. A study of Tenth Century Byzantium. By STEVEN RUNCIMAN. Pp. 275; 6 maps. Cambridge University Press, 1929. 16s.

BYZANTINE History has recently more than once been lifted like Cinderella from

among the ashes. One of her latest Fairy Godmothers is a Cambridge scholar, Steven Runciman, with this book on the usurping Emperor Romanus I. If the writer himself admits that his hero is 'a figure without charm,' we are none the less grateful for such a com-

prehensive and detailed record of a little known period, composed from little known sources. Mr. Runciman gives a list of these sources, and though 'the fundamental authorities,' viz. the Greek chroniclers, have nearly all been published in the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* or in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, yet those series are found in but few libraries. The Armenian works quoted are usually accessible in French translations, and the Latin ones in well-known compilations, but the Arabic authorities and other minor material have to be approached through Russian and Slavonic, a path which not many can tread.

Probably the majority of readers will most enjoy Chapters I.-IV., XII. and XIII., where we get first a general sketch of Byzantine life in the early tenth century, then the state of affairs under and after Leo VI., and finally the rise and fall of Romanus Lecapenus and his house. They will even resent the interruption in Romanus' story caused by Chapters V.-X., dealing with the various neighbours and enemies of the

Eastern Empire. Yet it is clearly on these, and especially on the spectacular careers of Symeon the Bulgarian and the Domestic John Curcuas, that Mr. Runciman has bestowed most research and pains.

One small criticism may be made. With comparatively few dates in the text and no chronological table at the end, we do not always realise whether the various foreign campaigns took place before or during or after the reign of Romanus. Indeed Mr. Runciman not infrequently assumes too much knowledge in his readers; thus he does not differentiate between Arabs and Turks, and once at least Nicephorus Phocas the general may easily be mistaken for his later namesake the emperor.

On the other hand, the movements of races in the Balkan Peninsula, and the changes of rule in Southern Italy (to choose two instances out of many), are very lucidly described, while the maps in the body of the work, and the appended bibliography, genealogies and index, all help to make this a valuable book to expert and amateur alike.

GEORGINA BUCKLER.

TWO BOOKS ON PLOTINUS.

Plotins Kategorien der intelligiblen Welt, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Idee, von GERHARD NEBEL (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie u. ihrer Geschichte, vol. 18). Pp. 54. Tübingen: Mohr, 1929. M. 3.

Plotins Leben, Untersuchungen zur Biographie Plotins, von HANS OPPERMANN (Orient u. Antike, vol. 7). Pp. 60. Heidelberg: Winter, 1929. M. 4.

THESE two essays are among the first-fruits of the serious critical study of Plotinus which is now being carried on in a number of German universities: both of them show a respect for accuracy of detail, and an avoidance of *a priori* judgments, which did not always characterise earlier work in this field. Nebel rightly holds 'dass ein Fortschritt der Plotinforschung und des Verständnisses des Neuplatonismus nur von genauester Einzelarbeit geleistet werden kann'; and Oppermann has expressed

himself to the same effect. Nebel's own book does, however, very happily combine the particular with the universal. Starting from an analysis of *Ennead* VI ii, he has found himself compelled to examine the meaning, as well as the structure, of Plotinus' 'intelligible world,' and its relation to Plato's; and he has made a courageous attempt to isolate the most important threads in the philosophical development which led from the one to the other. The interest of the book thus extends far beyond the doctrine of categories with which it is nominally concerned; it is a real contribution to the history of Neoplatonism, and one which no serious student can afford to overlook. Only a few salient points can be noted here. Stress is laid on the fundamental importance for Neoplatonic theory of *Sophistes* 248-9, taken in conjunction with the *παντελὲς ζῶον* of the *Timaeus*: already in Plato the *εἶδος*

tends to become a *voûs*, and the Ideal World is conceived as a living being, though for religious-aesthetic rather than metaphysical reasons. *Timaeus* 39E rendered easy the identification of Plato's demiurge with the Aristotelian *voûs*, and this in turn involved the doctrine *οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ νοῦ τὰ νοητά*: Nebel is disposed to think that this development had already begun in the Old Academy, and attaches little importance in this connection either to Poseidonius or to Philo. [He is perhaps inclined to underestimate the Stoic influence on Plotinus—e.g., in discussing *Enn.* VI ix 1, he ignores the parallelism with the Stoic doctrine of grades of unity corresponding to grades of goodness (Arnim II 366, 1013; III 160).] The Plotinian system is well defined as 'der am reinsten durchgeführte Synkretismus der Elemente der griechischen Tradition im Rahmen des hellenistischen Hypostasenschemas,' but with the qualification that neither the other-worldly doctrine of ecstasy nor the transcendence of the One seems to be 'pure Greek.' Bréhier, on the other hand, has recently told us that what makes the One un-Greek is not its transcendence but precisely its quasi-immanence—which may suggest that for the present we had better deal cautiously with the concept of the 'pure Greek.' In the later chapters of his essay Nebel shows clearly that the so-called 'categories' of the *Sophistes* have no true structural function in the system of Plotinus, and that the attempt to represent them as the *summa genera* of reality must be regarded as a failure.

Oppermann's little book is much more restricted in scope. Indeed, the title *Plotins Leben* is something of a misnomer, for the only topics dealt with are Plotinus' Tod and Porphyry's

method of dating. Chapter I argues at great length that Plotinus died of leprosy and not, as is commonly assumed, of the *κύναικος* (quinsy or diphtheria?) mentioned by Porphyry; it is shown by comparison with Greek medical writers that the clinical picture given by Porphyry is confused, and is in any case not that of *κύναικος*; while the symptoms attributed by the astrologer Firmicus Maternus to Plotinus are unmistakably those of leprosy. Firmicus' account is preferred to Porphyry's on the ground that it must derive its fullness of detail from a life of Plotinus by Eustochius, the physician-pupil who attended him in his last illness. But there is no other evidence of the existence of such a biography; and Porphyry's supposed suppression of the true facts seems inadequately explained by the suggestion that he wished to gloss over the cowardice of his fellow-pupils who deserted their master in his hour of need. Would not such desertion be more excusable in a case of leprosy than in any other? It appears easier to suppose that Firmicus, having no authority but Porphyry, and finding in Porphyry's account certain symptoms suggestive of leprosy, perceived edification in the idea that the philosopher who scoffed at the stars must have died the most dreadful of all deaths, and filled in the details accordingly, though he significantly refrains from specifying the disease by name. The second thesis of the book, that Porphyry in the *vita* dates by Egyptian (or possibly by Syro-Macedonian) years and not by years of *tribunicia potestas*, is more convincingly sustained; it is shown by a full and painstaking analysis that this is the only hypothesis which can be carried through without making Porphyry contradict himself on points of chronology.

E. R. DODDS.

A HISTORY OF GREECE.

A History of Greece. By C. E. ROBINSON. Pp. xii+480; 22 maps and plans; 24 plates. London: Methuen, 1929. 7s. 6d.

THIS book is a good representative of a new type of historical manual which does not confine itself to campaigns

and constitutions, but takes into account all the characteristic aspects of a people's life, and sacrifices unessential detail of names and dates and incidents in favour of a fuller appreciation of events and institutions. Mr. Robinson has shown discernment in sifting the

distinctive features of Greek history from its commonplaces; he has conveyed his points in a clear and telling style, and with a Hellenic candour and balance of judgment. As examples of his method we may quote his accounts of the First Peloponnesian War (459-51 B.C.), and of the diplomatic cross-purposes of 421-20, in both of which he extricates the essential points of the story with considerable skill; his studiously fair characterisations of complex personalities like Philip and Alexander of Macedon; above all, his description of Periclean Athens, in which he has combined the shadows and the high lights into a miniature Zimmern.

On questions of due proportion and correct emphasis complete unanimity of opinion is not to be looked for, but one or two criticisms may here be suggested. The narrative of the Peloponnesian War, which makes up one-seventh of the entire volume, would bear some further scaling down. On the other hand, a slightly fuller treatment of peace-and-war questions would have been welcome. The suppression of private war, the progressive regulation of inter-state disputes by treaties or arbitration, and the chief experiments in federal government (which, after all, was the most hopeful line of approach to Hellenic union), would appear to deserve more than a passing mention. And again, at this time of day it seems no longer unreasonable to expect some reference to the statecraft of the Hellenistic monarchs, or at any rate of the Ptolemies and the Attalids.

Another question of distributive justice is whether the other Greek states might not complain of the *πλεονεξία* of Athens in taking up too much of Mr. Robinson's space. The Greek artists outside of Attica, the early lyric poets (whose inventions of individualism and scepticism Mr. Robinson transfers to the sophists), the Stoic philosophers, and the scientists of Alexandria might without immodesty claim a more generous ration of letterpress.

Among the points of detail which invite comment the following may be mentioned here: (1) 'The strange thing is that the future cultural preeminence . . . of the Greeks was not to spring

from the true Greek or Dorian sources, but from the despised Ionians' (p. 23). This overlooks the fact that the Aegean Greeks were the chief depositaries of the old Minoan heritage. Moreover, the equation 'Greek = Dorian' ought to have been buried with Herodotus. (2) On p. 37 it is suggested that the Greeks passed directly from barter to coinage, without the intermediate use of metal currency by weight; consequently the effects of the introduction of coinage are exaggerated. (3) In the account of Athenian constitutional history no mention is made of two distinctive innovations, the introduction of election by lot for the Boule and for most of the magistrates; and it is practically certain that the minimum poll of 6,000 at an ostracism referred to the total of votes distributed over the whole field, not to those cast against any one person (p. 82). (4) An examination of traders' marks on exported Athenian vases indicates that these were not carried on Attic (p. 84), or on Corinthian (p. 142), but on Ionian (Chalcidian?) vessels. (5) The one sure fact about Themistocles' exile is that he died under Artaxerxes, *i.e.* after 464, not in 471 or 467 (p. 128). (6) Thucydides does not say that Nicias 'practised every virtue' (p. 227), but *ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην*—*i.e.*, respectability (an ill-concealed sneer); or that Antiphon was 'impeccably moral' (p. 234) but *ἀρετῇ οὐδενὸς ὕστερος*—*i.e.*, highly accomplished. (7) 'The dramatic rout of the King's enormous army by the Ten Thousand Greeks' (p. 297).—But Cunaxa was not by any means a Greek Plassey. (See W. W. Tarn, in *C.A.H.* VI., pp. 7-9.) (8) Doubts as to the existence of Councils and Assemblies in Hellenistic colonies (p. 413) are confined to Alexandria ad Aegyptum. (9) It is puzzling to read that the Romans were much better engineers than the Greeks (p. 170), and that they were wedded to hard-and-fast methods of administration (p. 377). (10) Can it be true that Athenian schoolboys learnt most of Homer by heart? (So on p. 12.) Surely this only holds good of a few young Macaulays. But details like these offer no true criterion of the value of Mr. Robinson's book. As an

introduction to Greek History it may be heartily recommended. It is certain to rouse interest, and it should leave

a clear and essentially just impression on the mind of the reader.

M. CARY.

A GREEK TRAGEDY OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Jephthah. By JOHN CHRISTOPHERSON. The Greek text edited and translated into English by F. H. Fobes, with an Introduction by W. O. Sypherd. Pp. 157. Newark, Delaware: The University of Delaware Press, 1928. Cloth, \$2.

CHRISTOPHERSON, whom Queen Mary made Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, was noted for 'his havock in burning poor Protestants,' and died in prison in the early days of Queen Bess; but he did also better work. Among other things he wrote a Greek tragedy, which survives in two autographs at Trinity and St. John's. Its first editors, in their introduction and translation, are too kind to its poetic and dramatic demerits, but they are alive to its faults of metre and diction. Here are lines

which a marginal note certifies to be 'Ανάπαιστοι:

δίχα λογισμὸς περὶ τῆς εὐχῆς
τῆς δὲ μεριμῆς, πότερον ὀρθῶς
ἤρκατο Κυρίῳ στόμα διοίγειν
δρχαμος ἡμῶν.

Here is a fair sample of the trimeters:

γῆρας σθένει μέλει μάλιστα μοι, γονεῦ,
τίς ἔσσεται τροφός· τὸ γὰρ κέλει Θεός,
τὰ τέκνα τῶν τεκόντων ἐν γῆρᾳ μέδειν,
καὶ τῶν θανόντων βλέφαρα κλείειν εὐπρεπῶς.
κτερίζμεν χρὴ κοσμίως· τὸ γὰρ πρόπον·
γέρας τελευτώντων τόδε μέγιστον κυρεῖ
ἀλόχου παρ' ἄλλης ἐστὶ σοὶ παιδοσπορεῖν·
ἀλλὰ δὲ θανόντος σοῦ τὸν ἄλλον οὐκ ἐνὶ
πατέρα πορεῖν. σὺ δὲρὸν ἐν βίῳ μένε.
τὴν κῆρα στέργῳ μάλα φίλης περὶ πατρίδος·
καὶ τῷ Θεῷ θνήσκειν βίου κρείττον καλοῦ.

Well, the College of Bentley and Porson has done better since: but think of his date, and be kind.

E. HARRISON.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT, PART IV.

A Greek-English Lexicon. Compiled by H. G. LIDDELL and R. SCOTT. A new edition . . . by H. STUART JONES and R. MCKENZIE. Part IV.: ἔξευ-
τονέω—θησαυριστικός. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929. Paper, 10s. 6d.

LEMMA under which additions or improvements or both will be found are ἔξωθεν (but read 'X. An. 5. 7. 21'), ἐπαίρω (Thuc. 1. 25), ἐπειδάν, ἐπηλύτης, ἐπιγράφω IV., ἐπιτροπῶν, ἐπιφοιτάω, εὐθενέω and εὐθηνέω, εὐχέρεια, Ζεύς, ἡδύς III., θείνω.

ἐξορμέω: where run out to sea?

ἐπαγγέλλω 6. The passages of Dem. can be brought under 2 (*impero*). Add E. Hip. 998 (Milton's emendation).

ἐπιμηθής: thoughtful repeats what Headlam called a bad mistake (C.R., 1904, 309).

ἐπίνοια might have been improved from Neil's note on Ar. Kn. 90.

ἐπιστομίζω. It would be well to say that in Pl. Grg. 482e there is a play on Πῶλος.

ἐπιτήδειος: -οι fem. occurs in Thuc. 5. 112.

ἐταιρεία III. = ἐταίρησις, And. 1. 100': only by a play upon words.

εὐθύ c. gen. might have gained from Richards, C.R., 1901, 442.

εὐσταλής in A. Pers. 795 rather *mobile* than *well-equipped*.

ἥβη. The limits of age are too narrow: see Platt in C.Q., 1915, 135.

ἥμισυς. The adverb ἡμισέως (better ἡμίσεως?) has come to its own.

θεμέλιος: enlarged, but a dubious view of Thuc. 3. 68 is still taken (note τῶν).

θελοντής: S. Aj. 24 should at least be mentioned.

Let me revert to Part III. Under ἐνειμι we read '3 sg. ἐνι freq. for fut. ἐνέσομαι.' That is new; if it is true, examples should be given.

Each part since the first has supplied Addenda and Corrigenda to itself and its predecessors—more Addenda than Corrigenda; but that may be put right in the final winding-up.

E. HARRISON.

HANNIBAL AS STATESMAN.

Hannibal als Politiker. Von EDMUND GROAG. Pp. 158. Vienna: Seidel, 1929. Paper, M. 8; bound, M. 9.

THIS book is a critical study of the conception of Hannibal's character and aims typified by the story of his oath upon the altar of Baal never to be a friend of Rome. The writer shows that Polybius, our main authority, could not fail to be influenced by the discussions of *Kriegsschuld* which took place in the circle of Scipio Aemilianus and Laelius at a time when renewal of war with Carthage was imminent. The view which gained the day in Rome was that 'Hannibal was directly responsible for the war, that his deliberate attack on Saguntum was a breach of law, and that the invasion of Italy was from the beginning the intention of the Carthaginian general.' It was inevitable that this theory should become the orthodox one when it was supported in Carthage itself, where Hannibal's opponents were mean enough to treat him as a scapegoat. No ancient historian took up cudgels on his behalf. (Professor Groag shows that there is no ground for attributing Punic sympathies even to Silenus and Sosylus.) In spite of the authority of Mommsen this view has been questioned by several modern historians, notably Meltzer, Kromayer, and Täubler, but it has never been so systematically examined as by Professor Groag. To him the doings of Hamilcar

and his successors in Spain seem to imply no hostility to Rome but merely a desire to find some compensation for the loss of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. The Ebro Treaty of 226 was a friendly delimitation of Roman and Carthaginian spheres of influence: it contained no mention of Saguntum, Rome's subsequent alliance with which was entirely illegal. This breach of faith on the part of Rome forced Hannibal into a war, the difficulty of which he clearly foresaw: he knew that he would have no adequate naval support. Even in the hour of his greatest success Hannibal did not seriously think of the 'destruction' of Rome. He came to Italy as the champion of the oppressed, a kind of Gustavus Adolphus or Napoleon, more likely than either to fulfil his promises. His activities after the war, first as a democratic politician in Carthage and then at the court of Antiochus, are interestingly described. Professor Groag thinks that his proposal of a second invasion of Italy had a better chance of success than is generally supposed.

This stimulating book ought to be in the hands of all serious students of the Second Punic War. Needless to say, it is very well documented and shows an intimate knowledge of recent contributions to the subject. If the writer sometimes overstates his case, it is not through ignorance of the objections which may be raised.

G. H. STEVENSON.

CICERO'S POLITICAL ESSAYS.

Cicero: De Re Publica, De Legibus. With an English translation by CLINTON WALKER KEYES. Pp. 533. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net.

THIS is a useful volume. Mr. Keyes has done much by his explanatory notes to make the reader's path an easy one, and the brief but clear introductions are well supplied with bibliographical information. There might possibly have been added a reference on p. 8 to C. Brakman's paper in *Mnem.* XLIX.,

1921, and one on p. 292 to G. Lazić's *Über die Entstehung von Ciceros Schrift de legibus*, Vienna, 1912. The lists of editions seem to be complete except for the omission of U. Pedrolí's edition of the *De Re Publica* (Part I, books 1 and 2, Florence, 1922); but there must now be added the new edition of Ziegler's text which has been published this year.

Mr. Keyes' text is perhaps a little too conservative, especially in its preferences for the first against the second hand of the Vatican palimpsest of the *De Re Publica*; for example, surely Ziegler is

right in accepting from the second hand in I. 60 *animi esse iure*, II. 11 *circuitu*, 21 *sumpsit*, 27 *sumptum*, 28 *mendacia*, 40 *uelatis cornicinibus*, 43 *retineat* and *uniusque*, 52 *pulsoque*; and yet none of these readings is even mentioned. In *De Legibus* II. 21 probably *oratores* should be read for *oratorium*; cp. P. Thomas, *Mnem.* XLIX., 1921, pp. 9-10. In III. 26 it is hard to believe that *improbam* is right. In II. 24 S. Eitrem has plausibly suggested *lutum* for *illud*; if Mr. Keyes is right in keeping *illud*, its vagueness recalls Aristophanes, *Equites* 571-2 *εἰ δὲ που πέσοιεν εἰς τὸν ὄμιον ἐν μάχῃ τινί, | τοῦτ' ἀπεψήσαντ' ἄν, εἴτ' ἤροοντο μὴ πεπτωκέαναι*. Mr. Keyes gives many textual notes, but he by no means always records a departure from manuscript authority, nor, as already seen, does he always record the readings of the two hands of the palimpsest; for example, in *De Re Publica* I. 2 there is no note that *discripta* and *turpitudinis* are conjectures, in I. 25 *oppositu* is the corrected reading of the palimpsest but is given as a conjecture of Beier's, in I. 42 *aut delectis* is given as Mai's conjecture but it is the reading of the second hand and the first hand has not *adiectis* but *adlectis*, in I. 47 we are told that *ut Rhodi ut Athenis* 'is commonly read' but not that it was written by the second hand, in VI. 22 and 25 some MSS. have *nobis* and *dederis* which are both given as conjectures of Halm's. In I. 30 the palimpsest does not give *fit*, which was proposed by Vahlen, but *sit*, and in II. 39 the second hand gives not LXXXVIII but LXXXVIII. Mr. Keyes makes one emendation and

puts it in the text; in *De Legibus* II. 38 he reads *curriculaeque . . . constituta* in place of the ablative.

The translation is on the whole adequate and readable. On p. 27 'they have neither learned nor do they teach anything about the principles of the State, either to establish it or to safeguard it' and on p. 121 'placed on the everywhere steep and precipitous hill-sides' is Latin rather than English idiom; on p. 423 *discessu meo* would be better translated 'when I was exiled' than 'in the matter of my exile'; on p. 419 would not 'sweet seductiveness' fairly represent *dulcedine corruptelaque* instead of 'sweetness and debilitating seductiveness'? On p. 27 'descend' would translate *descendere* well enough without the addition of 'from his lofty heights'; on p. 35 'become acquainted with' is too weak for *perdisceret*, and so also is 'provided with' for *distinctam* on p. 65. In *De Legibus* III. 32 *obsunt* is not translated.

Misprints are few, but read on p. 216 *Servium* for *Servius*, p. 264 *tu eris* for *te eris*, p. 364 *nam cum* for *nam eum*, and on p. 238 delete the meaningless comma after *accessit*. Some slips in the notes want correcting; p. 170 the date of the fall of Spurius Cassius is not 'according to tradition about 496' but 485 B.C.; p. 289 Clodius' death is dated January 20, 52 B.C. instead of January 18; p. 422 Cicero was not in exile 57-56 but 58-57 B.C. Mr. Keyes ends his book with an index of proper names in which the reader will find that it is not assumed that he knows Crete is a 'large island S. of Peloponnesus.'

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

CICERO'S LETTERS TO HIS FRIENDS.

Cicero: The Letters to His Friends.

With an English translation by W. GLYNN WILLIAMS, M.A. Three vols. Pp.: Vol. I., xxviii + 524; Vol. II., xxviii + 632. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann, Ltd.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.

ADEQUATE translations of Cicero's correspondence are already available; but

this is, I believe, the first that has appeared in combination with a Latin text, and, considered merely as such, it cannot fail to be welcomed by students of history whose grasp of Latin is insecure. Further, as a translator, Mr. Williams is, in my judgment, competent for the task he has undertaken. His version is agreeable; it is written in lucid English of sustained vigour, while good taste and literary feeling are con-

spicuous throughout. But, welcome though these handsome and convenient volumes are sure to be, it lay within the editor's reach to render them more welcome still. The chronological order of the Letters has been ascertained, and they have been elsewhere issued in that order. Why, then, has Mr. Williams chosen to leave them in the chaotic welter into which the first editor flung them? Had he given them in their historical sequence, his edition must have distanced all competitors by saving his readers the grievous loss of time and temper involved in the inconvenience not only of turning continually from one group of the Letters to another, but also of finding within the same group one letter many years earlier or later than another immediately preceding or following it. Possibly, however, in this matter Mr. Williams may not have had a free hand. It is less easy to suggest an excuse for a second defect—for so I deem it—in this edition—namely, the text. This, we are told, is 'based on that of Nobbe (1849).' Nobbe's text can only be described as obsolete. True, Mr. Williams' practice is better than his profession: he has introduced many, though too few, modifications of Nobbe's text, drawn chiefly from the monumental edition of Tyrrell and Purser. Yet much water has flown under the bridge during the thirty or forty years which have elapsed since the appearance of the Dublin commentary, and of these recent contributions to his subject Mr. Williams appears to have taken little or no notice. In particular he has ignored completely the Teubner edition of 1925. Yet the value of this work has been widely recognised. It is based on a re-examination of the Medicean MS.; and the editor, a competent scholar of wide erudition, has included in his *apparatus criticus*, which is a marvel of condensed information, a conspectus of all that is most valuable in recent work bearing on the Letters. There are few pages of Mr. Williams' text that do not in one or more places conflict with the new Teubner text—I have counted some ninety such divergences in the first three books alone—and in scarcely

one of these does it appear to me that his position is defensible. The space at my disposal forbids me to notice more than a small fraction of these diversities. A single page (Vol. II., p. 518) of an interesting letter, illustrating Cicero's attitude towards one of the two greatest crimes in history, will illustrate Mr. Williams' attitude towards the work of his predecessors. In this letter the MSS. give (*Fam.* XII. 1. 1) 'sed ita compressa est, ut mihi videamur,' etc., where the noun agreeing with 'compressa' has apparently dropped out. Mr. Williams simply prints the conjecture 'compressum,' a reading difficult to justify on critical grounds, and says nothing of Dr. Purser's fine emendation 'sed ita *seditio* compressa est,' to which this objection does not apply. The lines which follow contain two obvious misprints, 'tuamur' for 'tuemur,' and 'explicamus' for 'explicemus'; but a few lines further on 'senatus consulta falsa deferuntur' must be intentional, because *deferre* is explained in a footnote. This note, however, does not mention the fact that the MSS. give '*referuntur*,' a quite unimpeachable reading, as appears from *Cic. Phil.* V. 12 (alluding to the same circumstances), 'senatus etiam consulta falsa referebat.' *Scita* were 'recorded' in registers (*referre in tabulas*) before they were 'lodged in the archives' (*deferre ad aerarium*). Cicero continues (§ 2): 'adhuc ultra suas iniurias est (resp.) per vos interitu tyranni; nihil amplius; ornamenta vero sua quae recuperavit?' Mr. Williams renders 'nihil amplius' 'That is all.' Consider the context. In the previous sentence Cicero had told Cassius that, by murdering Caesar, 'you have, I admit, rendered our country a greater service than it ever entered my mind to pray for: a magnificent boon, but—' To conclude this outburst by adding, 'so far the only thing our country has gained by the tyrant's fall is to redress her wrongs,' is surely an impotent conclusion, if not a contradiction in terms. Moreover, if this is the meaning, logic demands that the next clause should begin, not with '*ornamenta vero*,' but with '*ornamenta enim*.' So above, § 1: 'ut adhuc quidem actum est, non regno

sed rege liberati videmur; interfecto enim rege regis omnis nutus tuetur.' On the other hand, *vero* indicates that 'nihil amplius' is a concession, which the adversative particle modifies, just as in the previous clause *sed* modifies the concession *quidem*: 'by the despot's fall at your hands our country has been enabled to avenge her wrongs: *nothing could be more splendid*; but which of her old dignities has she recovered?' Mr. Williams either has or has not read Lehmann's discussion of these passages. In either case I think his readers have a grievance.

Take again VI. 13. 2: there the MSS. give 'quorum quidem et virtute et pietate et amor in te singularis et perpetua cura salutis tantum proficit ut —,' an impossible combination of ablatives and nominatives. The Loeb text silently omits 'et virtute et pietate,' an uncritical expedient, which robs the statement of half its force. The trouble arose from the corruption of 'proficitur' into 'proficit,' which entailed a corresponding change of 'amore singulari' into 'amor singularis.' Active and passive third person terminations are not infrequently confounded (VI. 4. 4; VIII. 11. 3; XII. 28. 2). So in VI. 1. 2, where Mr. Williams, though printing 'coguntur,' translates 'cogunt.'

This uncritical attitude towards MS. authority becomes especially serious when it affects the very texture of epistolary Latin. Cicero prided himself on the colloquial colour of his correspondence: IX. 21. 1: 'quid tibi ego in epistulis videor? nonne plebeio sermone agere tecum? quid enim simile habet epistula aut iudicio aut contioni?' This conversational idiom ('cotidiana verba') occasionally suffers in the Loeb text. Thus we there read in IX. 16. 1: 'ego tibi accurate rescripseram ut *quo modo* in tali re atque tempore aut liberarem te aut,' etc. This is a wanton violation of the MSS. 'quo modo'; cf. *Att.* IX. 7. 3: 'quo modo in tali insania': 'considering the prevailing frenzy.' In this phrase 'quo modo' is a colloquial abbreviation of the full phrase 'quo modo res se habet' (*Q.F.* II. 2. 1; *Fam.* XIV. 14. 1): 'seeing how the matter stands'; cf. *Att.* XIII. 2. 2: 'quo modo nunc est, pedem ubi ponat

non habet': 'such is his present plight, he has not a leg to stand on,' and the relative is used as in 'quae est vestra prudentia' (*Class. Phil.* XXX., 1912, p. 7).

So with other conversational forms, e.g. *asyndeton*, especially that between two synonyms, the so-called 'asyndeton bimbembre,' as in *Plaut. Trin.* 245: 'ilico res foras labitur, liquitur.' Thus in *Fam.* V. 20. 2, where the MSS. give 'rationes confectas collatas' (like *Plaut. Bacch.* 935: 'tabellas obsignatas consignatas'), the Loeb text inserts the copula; it does the same in III. 8. 2, 'vultu taciturnitate'; III. 12. 1, 'virtutis industriae'; X. 34. 4, 'vitam studium.' It deals in a similar way with this *asyndeton* between clauses in *Fam.* XII. 2. 2: 'intellegit enim populus R. tres esse consulares, qui, quia de rep. bene senserint, libere locuti sint, tuto in senatum venire non possint.' Here the editor, while adhering to M.'s quite ungrammatical 'sunt,' corrupts the idiomatic *asyndeton* by inserting a very cacophonous 'quae' after 'qui quia.'

In conclusion, I may observe that in many places the Loeb text can be improved by that master-key of criticism—punctuation. Thus in VII. 13. 2 the change of a full-stop after 'repetunt' into a comma might relieve the passage of two deplorable conjectures—'at tu non soles' for the MSS. 'et tu soles.' In I. 9. 21 we are given, 'accepisti quibus rebus adductus, quamque rem causamque defenderim,' which Mr. Williams, taking 'quamque' as a relative, labours in vain to translate. Remove the comma after 'adductus' and 'quamque' becomes accusative of 'quisque.' So *ibid.* 23: 'sunt orationes quaedam neque ita multae; ne pertimescas,' which is rendered 'don't be alarmed,' as if Cicero had written 'ne pertimueris.' Punctuate '... neque ita multae, ne pertimescas' and all is well. In I. 10 *fin.* Mr. Williams reads and punctuates 'nam illo si veneris, tanquam Ulixes, cognosces tuorum neminem.' This he translates: 'for if you get *there*, you will be like Ulysses and not recognise a single friend'; and he adds a note charging Cicero with ignorance of his *Odyssey*. But we now know that M¹ reads 'tam Ulixes'; and if, accepting

this, we punctuate 'nam illo si veneris tam Ulixes, cognosces,' etc.: 'for if you arrive there such a Methuselah,

you will have forgotten all your friends,' we save Cicero's credit.

W. T. VESEY.

BORNECQUE AND PRÉVOST'S *HEROIDES* OF OVID.

Ovide, Héroïdes. Texte établi par HENRI BORNECQUE, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Lille, et traduit par MARCEL PRÉVOST, de l'Académie Française. Pp. xxiii+164 (really 328). Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' 1928. 20 fr.

ENCOUNTERS between Ovid and the French Academy have not always been happy, and Anatole France's amended text of *trist.* IV 10 42 is dropped by common consent into the neighbouring stream of Lethe when the two authors sit down together in Elysium for a chat about the art of love. But Mr Prévost has not to wrestle with recension. His translation is true in general to his announcement of its purpose, that it 's'attache d'abord à être fidèle'; it is simple, straightforward, and manly, without amplification or paraphrase or sacrifices to conventional elegance. Twice at least he is right where most translators and commentators are wrong: II 12 *procellosos uela referre notos* 'que les orageux autans refoulaient tes voiles' and V 156 *non ego cum Danaïs arma cruenta fero* 'je n'apporte pas, moi, une guerre sanglante avec les Grecs.' If he is not always able to say as he desires 'j'ai mis le lecteur français en face du texte français, dans l'état où se trouvait le lecteur latin en face du texte latin,' that is because fidelity must in the last resort depend upon knowledge, and his knowledge is imperfect.

Many of his renderings are mistakes in Latin which would draw down censure on a schoolboy. II 53 *quo* 'où sont,' III 50 *pectora iactantem* 'laisser échapper ses entrailles,' 79 *scindi capillos* 'qu'on me coupe les cheveux' ('signe d'esclavage' adds Mr Bornecque), 109 *nulla Mycenaeum sociasse cubilia mecum* 'aucun Mycénéen ne partagea mon lit,' 126 *Pelias hasta* 'ta lance reçue de Pélee' (Mr Bornecque again agrees, 'Pélee l'avait reçue lui-même de Pallas'), IV 30 *tenui ungue* 'précaution-

neux,' 72 *flava ora* 'hâlé,' 87 *incinctae* 'à la tunique flottante,' 99 *arsit et Oenides in Maenalia Atalanta* 'sur le Ménale,' VI 104 *aurea Phrixiae terga reuellit ouis* 'arracha la toison d'or au béliet de Phrixus,' 108 *patria Phasidis* 'Phase natal,' 118 *me dotales inter habere* 'me ranger parmi les femmes bien dotées,' VII 172 *ciectam ratem* 'l'élan d'un navire,' IX 3 f. *fama factis infitianda tuis* 'une nouvelle contredite par tes prouesses,' 9 f. (*nox una*) *non tanti* 'pas assez grande,' 12 *humili sub pede* 'faible,' X 44 *torpuerant molles ante dolore genae* 'la douleur jusque-là avait arrêté les larmes qui apaisent,' 110 *illic, qui silices, Thesea, uincat, habes* 'là, Thésée, tu possèdes de quoi vaincre le caillou,' XII 46 *devota manu* 'docile,' XIII 101 *terris altior* (above the horizon) 'au plus haut, par-dessus la terre,' XVI 58 *arbore nixus* 'ayant grimpé sur un arbre,' 343 *ecqua* 'laquelle,' XVIII 187 *aestus* (warm weather) *adhuc tamen est* 'et encore n'est-ce en ce moment qu'un orage,' XIX 113 *fallit* (opp. *nosse*) 'troublent,' XX 123 f. *hostibus, et si quis . . . repugnat, | sic sit ut . . . solet esse mihi* 'et si quelque ennemi s'oppose,' 228 *amplius utque nihil, me tibi iungit amor* 'et, ce qui passe tout,' 239 *ponetur imago* 'que l'image soit présentée.' I have passed over others which are in fact no better, X 52 *exhibiturus*, XIII 23 *tenebris obortis*, XV 41 *etiam*. The following, if they are not downright errors, are extreme examples of licence: II 72 *pulsata regia* 'l'irruption dans les royaumes,' VII 62 *bibat aquas* 's'engloutisse dans les flots,' IX 35 *ipsa domo uidua* 'moi, veuve au logis,' XVI 376 *nomen ab aeterna posteritate feres* 'tu porteras ton nom à la postérité éternelle.' It is only fair to say that in some of his worst mistakes, even at X 110, Mr Prévost has predecessors. Often, without actually violating the language, he misinterprets the author's words. I 10 *pendula tela* (*met.* IV 395 *pendens uestis*) 'inachevée,' 26 *patrios*

deos (opp. *barbara*) 'de nos pères,' II 30 *instar* (importance) 'apparence,' III 32 *pondere et arte pares* (inter se) 'où le poids et l'art s'équivalent,' 142 *sustinet hoc animae* (hanc animulam) *spes tamen una tui* 'ce qui le (*corpus*) soutient, c'est dans mon âme une espérance unique: toi,' IV 118 *nati digna uigore* (digna uigore nati) *parens* 'mère digne de son fils par sa vaillance,' 128 *quem* (tu quem) with *lectum*, V 77 *aperta aequora* (thes. L. L. II p. 220 42-56) 'faciles,' IX 18 *Hercule supposito sidera fulsit Atlans* 'Hercule soutenait les astres quand Atlas les étaya,' 123 *auerti* (que je me détourne) 'qu'on l'éloigne,' XI 10 *auctoris oculis exigeretur* (ἐξερασθεῖν) *opus* 'que l'acte fût consommé sous les yeux de l'auteur,' XVI 71 *ne recusarem imperat* (forbids me to refuse) 'de peur que je refuse, il commande,' 163 *quae sit Paridi constantia* (quanta c. mea sit) 'ce qu'est la constance pour Paris,' 200 *cum dis potando nectare* (cum nectare dis potando) *miscet aquas* 'parmi les dieux mêle l'eau au nectar qu'ils vont boire,' XVII 26 *meum* with *crimen*, 129 *laudibus istis* (laudatricis Veneris) 'tes louanges,' XVIII 35 *inceptis iuuenalibus* (νεανικαῖς, vigoureux) 'ma juvénile entreprise,' 148 *nector* (passager) 'passeur,' XIX 45 *ferre* (d'ordinaire) 'presque,' XX 131 f. *ad limina* (hac illac eo) 'vers ta maison,' XXI 203 f. *me infensam habet* (infensa sum illi, XVI 282 *habeas faciles*, Liu. XXVIII 34 10 *iratos habere*) 'il me croit irritée,' 214 *scriptis* (in malo) *eminus icta tuis* 'ta lettre m'a frappée de loin,' 232 *tu ueniam nostris uocibus* (pour mes paroles) *ipse petas* 'par ma voix' ('c'est-à-dire en mon nom' says Mr Bornecque). The sense of *eras ante* I 44, *prohibe* V 118, and *facta* VI 5 is quite misunderstood.

Mr Prévost sometimes mistranslates under compulsion, because Mr Bornecque has given him a text which must be mistranslated if it is not to be nonsense. When at XIX 62 he renders *nostra* by 'ta,' that is not ignorance but dire necessity; and presumably also when he takes II 109 *meae cui as tuas quae*, II 5 *cui mea as cuius tibi*, and XI 48 *dena as decima*. At XI 34 he is obliged to pretend that he does not know *amans* from *amor* because Mr Bornecque has chosen to print *erat* instead of *eram*;

and his absurd translation of XVI 77-9 is caused, though it cannot be excused, by an absurd punctuation. But now and again the interpreter loses patience and defies the editor: he has dared to translate the true readings VI 7 *signatur*, X 73 *tum*, XVI 145 *crede*, XVII 173 *relicta*, XX 76 *parua*, XXI 64 *iactas*, instead of what Mr Bornecque has put in their place.

Mr Bornecque's share of the work is much worse done. As he has collated no MS, he had only to report the witness of Sedlmayer or (for P) of Palmer; and this simple task he has been unable to perform without making more than 200 false statements, in which total I do not include transparent and corrigible misprints such as *ereandis* or *sribenti* or *fraximus*. Many of his notes are nonsense, like VI 144 *fruit* PG, *foret* P, where the second P should be E, or X 30 *tenta* G, *tenta* P, which should be *tenta* P, *tensa* G. Many of them exactly reverse the truth, as VII 12 *quaeque* P, *quae* GE and 153 *quaeris* PG, *quaerit* E. P¹ is so often substituted for P² and P² for P¹ that the printers are emboldened to such facetiousness as P¹ P² P² Pr. In Palmer's edition there is a photograph of the page of P containing VIII 30-57: Mr Bornecque contradicts it seven times. At XII 71 his note on the three words *noscis an exciderunt* contains five falsehoods, not reckoning a misprint. His note on VII 26, *Aenean* GE, *Aeneanque* P, is all false: the truth is -an P, -anque G, -amque E. At XVI 219 P has *conuiuia* for *conuiuia*: he says it has *omnia* for *talia*. His antiquated text of VII 71 is *quicquid id est, totum merui*; *concedite, dicas*, in which the plural imperative is addressed, he says, to the phantom of Dido. The true note on this would be *Quidquid id codd. rec., quid id E, quid tanti* PG: *totum* P² G et corr. ex *tum* E, *tutum* P¹, ut *tum* Madvig: *dicas* P, *dices* GE. Mr Bornecque's is *Quicquid* PG, *quid* E: *merui* om. E: *quid tante est ut* *tum* codd. rec. Madvig et Palmes: one true statement, six false (but Sedlmayer is chiefly to blame for *merui* om. E), three suppressions of material fact, and a misprint. That all other editors since 1871 have printed *quid tanti est ut* *tum* 'merui, concedite' *dicas* the reader

must find out for himself. A true note on VIII 77 *flebat anus Phoebeque soror* would be *Phoebeque Mezeriacus, phoebeque P, flebatque G*: Mr Bornecque's is *Flebat P, flebatque G*, which he means for a note on the first word in the verse and doubtless fancies that he has copied from his authorities. For he has not learnt to read an apparatus criticus, and some of his mistakes are due less to negligence than to ignorance of his trade. Sedlmayer, though not a model of neatness and precision, is seldom ambiguous or unintelligible; but Mr Bornecque contrives to misunderstand him. At I 85 he says that G has *ille tu* for *ille*: the meaning of Sedlmayer's note is that it has *tu* for *tamen*. At II 15 he says that E has *ne dum* for *interdum*: Sedlmayer said that it had *ne dum* for *ne dum*. At VII 59 he says it has *amor et mater* for *mater Amorum*: Sedlmayer said it had *et* for *quia*. Where his authorities have committed errors, Mr Bornecque will make them worse: Sedlmayer's reports of E at II 137 and IV 169 are false, but less false than what Mr Bornecque has substituted; and probably he is quite unaware that he has made any substitution. For he is no more skilful at framing an apparatus than at using one, and does not know how to say what he wants to say. Take III 67: text *reditusque placent*, note *reditus PG, redditus E: placent PG, placeant E*: this means either that all three MSS omit *que* or that all present it; and neither is true. His note on VII 65, though he does not guess it, means that P and E have *te*, which they have not: the lemma should have been *age te G*. XVII 53 *et P², eea P¹, quod G* is both false and unintelligible, for there are two *et*'s in the verse and it refers to neither: it should be *Et P² G, ea P¹*. Similarly his notes on XIII 7 and 21 leave the reader not merely in ignorance but in conscious and aching ignorance. His note on XIII 29, *Vt P, utque G*, is not false, but no falsehood could be more deceitful, and a reader who finds out the truth will be somewhat indignant. At one moment he will record such utterly insignificant variants as *acerua* for *acerba* or *dii* for *di*; at another he will print *petendo* (XIV 61) without saying that the

MS lections are *tinendo tenendo timendo*, silently substitute *est* for *et* (VII 19) or *cum* for *quo* (XIV 86) or *tu* for *io* (103) or *sibi* for *tibi* (XX 244), or silently suppress a *dum* in VII 179.

The verses XVI 39-144 are said on p. 1 to be preserved by the cod. Treuiranus (*i.e.* of Trèves) saec. XIII, and on p. XX by 'un manuscrit de Trévise, du XVI^e.' Neither is ever mentioned in the notes, for the sufficient reason that the one does not contain the verses and the other does not exist. Mr Bornecque's delusions appear to spring from the fact that in Vat. Gr. 1480 saec. XVI the verses are rendered into Greek by Thomas Triuisianus.

A recension of Ovid by this scholar can have no importance. It is chiefly distinguished by its freedom in admitting conjectures, on condition that they are causeless and useless, and its readiness to expel verses as interpolated, provided that there is nothing against them. Among all that has been written on the *heroides* Mr Damsté's paper in *Mnem.* 1905 pp. 1-56 is conspicuous for shallowness and futility; but in him Mr Bornecque has found a kindred spirit, and uses nearly 30 of his conceits to disfigure or lacerate the text. His own proposals, which are fewer, might be mistaken for Mr Damsté's. Those at XII 151, XIV 49, and XVI 352 are not bad, but that is because they are not his. Accuracy in the ascription of conjectures is not to be expected from him, and he wrongly assigns more than 20. Palmer in his 1st ed. adopted at III 48, instead of *mihi*, the much inferior *mea* which Keil had falsely reported from P: in his 2nd ed. he abandoned it, but Mr Bornecque prints it still and attributes it to Palmer. At XV 198 he gives *plectra dolore iacent, muta dolore lyra* and his note is '*iacent* Housman, *tacent* codd.: *lyra* Housman, *lyra est libri*.' Bad as the verse was already, this namesake of mine has made it worse, and Mr Prévost very properly ignores his aimless and mischievous meddling. The fact is that Mr Bornecque, who probably has never read anything that I have written, saw an emendation of mine cited on p. lvii of Palmer's edition, but could not transcribe it. His inadequacy to an

editor's task is visible at every turn. At I 2 he prints *attamen*, fourth word in its sentence, without saying or knowing that the oldest authority gives *attinet*. At XX 223 he prints *Carthaeis* for *Coryciis*, in evident ignorance of *papyr. Oxy.* 1011 u. 56, which has been before the world ever since 1910. At X 143, where the true sense is yielded by the *ne* of the best MSS, he prints *nec*, which is not even Latin, because Madvig's edition of the *de finibus*, though published in 1839, has not yet come his way. Some of the misprints in the text, as at XI 38, XV 139, and XVII 207, are formidable. One would suppose that *fluctuosa* II 121, *Sychaeu* VII 97, *Tegaeus* IX 87, *credes* XVI 145 were also misprints, did they not recur in the notes or the index. Because Ovid says *Cressa puella* and *Thressa puella*, the

index has 'Cressus, a, um' and 'Thressus, a, um'; because he says *geminas Leucippidas*, it has 'Leucippidae'; because he says *cum Minyis* and *orat opem Minyis*, it has 'Minyi'. From the explanatory notes it may be learnt that Neptune was the grandfather of Theseus and Jupiter the father of Leda, that Arcas was turned into a bear along with his mother, that Troezen is situate at the isthmus of Corinth, and that the Mygdonian marble came from Macedon. At V 30 Oenone mentions Xanthus and evokes from Mr Bornecque this comment: 'Rivière de Troade. Elle prenait sa source dans le Taurus et se jetait dans la mer de Lycie'. There should be a companion note on *Paris* in the same distich: 'Fils de Priam. Selon Henri IV il valait bien une messe.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE ROMAN FORT AT OLD KILPATRICK.

The Roman Fort at Old Kilpatrick. By S. N. MILLER, M.A. Pp. xvii + 63; 27 plates and 3 text-figures. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie and Co., 1928. 12s. 6d.

The site of Old Kilpatrick lies on the east bank of the Clyde, at the point where it widens out to the estuary. Previous investigation had shown that here the Wall of Antoninus Pius reached its western end, and that here was a fort, presumably interesting as the terminal station, lying at a point where sea communication would be convenient. Under the threat of imminent building operations the Glasgow Archaeological Society carried out two campaigns in 1923 and 1924, under the superintendence of Mr. Miller, with the excellent results recorded, with the clearness and precision which we have learnt to expect from its author, in the present volume. Not all the area could be examined, the remains were shallow and desperately ruined, and the small finds consequently scanty. But uncovered with great care and interpreted with equal caution and ingenuity, they enable the history of the site to be substantially recovered. The fort inside the defences covers 4½ acres, and the arrangement of what barrack blocks could

be examined agrees with this area to suggest a *cohors milliaria* as the original garrison. In the most instructive areas two reconstructions could be recognised: the first substantial, and following a complete destruction, e.g. the Headquarters Building; the second partial, and very roughly executed. This agrees with the other evidence from Scottish forts, and confirms the view of a far-reaching disaster about 160 A.D., and an attempt to hold out during the troubled years around 180 A.D.

The ramparts were of turf on a stone footing, the H.Q., one granary, and latrines, of stone, another granary—and this is interesting in view of recent discoveries at Richborough—of wood, as were also the barrack buildings. Two points, moreover, add particular interest to the site. (1) The lay-out of the defensive ditches seems to show that an area extending to the river bank was enclosed, then the fort was constructed in the part remote from the river, and only subsequently was the continuous barrier brought up to this and carried beyond it to the water's edge. That is to say, the first construction was a fortified quay defended by a free-standing fort, though Mr. Miller argues convincingly that the whole was carried out in connection

with the defensive policy initiated by Lollius Urbicus. To show the inherent probability and the utility of such provision for sea-borne supplies he quotes with great effect the passage from Arrian's *Periplus* which describes an arrangement similar, though differing in details, made at the fort which commanded the mouth of the Phasis. That the supplies thus made available were used during the construction of the Wall of Pius, Mr. Miller argues from the gaps in the defensive ditches at the south-west angle of the fort, which allowed the passage of a cobbled road, traces of which were found. It is a difficulty, though not an insuperable one, that the continuation of this road must have led along the north side of the Vallum, separated from the Wall by the ditch, which, as Sir George Macdonald seems to have shown (*J. R. S. XI.*, p. 17 f.), were constructed simultaneously in a direction from east to west, so that the ditch must have lain between at least some of the working-parties and their rations. (2) There were clear traces of a previous occupa-

tion of the site. An eccentric ditch and what may well be the remains of a clay rampart could not be brought into relation with the Antonine remains. On all parts of the site—though not in very considerable quantities—were sherds datable to the Domitian-Trajan period. While there are perhaps grounds for thinking that some types illustrated have been somewhat antedated, and that hardly enough allowance has been made for survivals of earlier pieces—at Wroxeter four vessels as early as some of the fragments here in question, including Plate XII. 2, remained unbroken in a building completed in 130 and destroyed about 160—yet there still remains enough evidence to substantiate some kind of occupation between 80 and 100 A.D., and given the conditions more than this could hardly be hoped for.

This excavation and its Report have materially increased the debt of gratitude which Mr. Miller and the Glasgow Archaeological Society had already imposed on students of Roman Britain by their previous association.

DONALD ATKINSON.

SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

Roman History Extracts and Outlines.

By A. N. W. SAUNDERS. Pp. 165.

London: Harrap, 1929. 2s. 6d.

MR. SAUNDERS has made an interesting experiment. 'The best way,' he says, 'of learning the history of Rome and breathing the atmosphere of Rome is to read what the Romans had to say in their own language.' Accordingly he introduces into his narrative numerous extracts from Latin writers, so that about one-third of the book is in Latin. He has a gift for making history clear; as a first sketch his book is excellent. The extracts add much to the interest, especially when it is possible to quote the words of the principal characters; e.g. the passage from the speech of C. Gracchus, from Aulus Gellius (*X. iii. 3*), helps to explain the Social War, and the well-chosen extracts from Cicero make the history of the time more vivid. It seems a pity not to include a few quotations from the letters of Caesar and Pompey; they help to

convince the schoolboy that these names belong to real human beings. Unfortunately it is often impossible to quote contemporary evidence, and we have to be content with what we are told by Velleius or Suetonius or others writing long afterwards, and this is much less interesting. It would be well to add a page giving the dates and perhaps a few words on the value of the works quoted. It is surprising to find Caesar represented as the author of the *Bellum Hispaniense*, 'the worst book in Latin literature,' as Dr. Rice Holmes calls it (*Rom. Rep. iii. 298*).

A Progressive Course of Latin Unseens.

Selected and edited by H. A. HENDERSON and C. W. BATY. Pp. 192.

Oxford University Press, 1929. 3s. 6d.

THIS is an excellent book for fourth and fifth forms. It begins with easy passages, mostly in prose, such as well-trained pupils who have read a little Caesar and Vergil should be able to

make out. It gradually leads up to such passages as might be set in a Matriculation examination paper, and includes, in addition, a few such authors as Lucretius and Terence. The pieces are well chosen and graded with good judgment. In length, in difficulty, and in style each is well suited for its place in the book. There are 340 extracts, which should provide plenty to choose from in several successive forms.

Elementary Latin. By H. GARDNER.
London: Bell, 1929. 4s. 6d. (Part I., 3s. 6d.; II., 2s.)

THIS book, by an experienced preparatory schoolmaster, is a good one for young beginners. 'I have attempted,' says the author, 'to provide a book from which even the youngest can be left to learn something for himself, enabling the master to divide his time between the two or more divisions into which a beginners' class inevitably splits after a few weeks of term.' The material is well arranged, the explanations, though sometimes rather fanciful, are full and clear, and plenty of practice is given. On the other hand, it is, I think, a mistake to introduce so many uncommon words, e.g. *deses, glis, virus*; they take some time to learn and will be forgotten before they are met with in reading. A more serious fault is that the Latin is not always quite correct; some words are used in wrong senses, e.g., *eum nescio* for 'I do not know him,' *peto* for *quaero* with an indirect question. It is not true that the Present Infinitive may stand in indirect discourse for the Imperfect as well as for the Present; it is a pity to lead the beginner to suppose that there is any ambiguity about, say, *dixi eum valere*. But in spite of such defects the book may be recommended as a good introduction to Latin for those who have plenty of time.

Sensim. A Systematic Course in Latin Unseen Translation. By R. D. WORMALD. Book I., pp. 95, 1s. 9d.; Book II., pp. 143, 2s. 6d. London: Arnold, 1929.

IN Book I. the first eighty prose passages are arranged under syntax headings (e.g. Dependent Questions), so as

to provide short readings which may be studied alongside of some book of exercises. A good deal of help is given, except in the last few pieces, so that we have rather a reader (without a dictionary) than an ordinary book of unseens. Such a book is useful for occasional study, but it lacks the interest of a continuous text, and it is not so good for building up a vocabulary; the words learnt today are not so likely to occur tomorrow. The editor thinks it important that the extracts should 'really be "Unseens" for everybody,' and has therefore taken most of them 'from such authors or parts of authors as are not ordinarily read in school.' Hence some of them, because of their style or their wording, are not very useful for training beginners to read the best authors; e.g. in the story of the unbreakable glass from Petronius 51 we find, among other uncommon expressions, *conditura, martiolum, fecit se porrigere, non pote valdius quam expavit*.

Book II. provides a good selection of extracts for written translation. 'It is intended to take a pupil to School Certificate standard,' and most of the 180 pieces are such as might be set in that examination. Help is given with the earlier passages.

Latin for Beginners. By R. M. ALLARDYCE. London: Arnold, 1929. 3s. 6d.

THIS book, on the other hand, is suitable only for older pupils. It seeks to take them on rapidly, and introduces in each section a very large number of new words and forms. I doubt whether it gives enough practice at each stage, especially in writing Latin, to make the beginner really familiar with the ways of a highly inflected language. The book is well arranged, and the reading matter, which is reproduced, but 'in an entirely different setting,' from the *New Latin Course*, is good. The author shows considerable skill in writing an interesting story in such a way as to introduce only the constructions which have been explained. There are some careless mistakes: *ludi* is twice given as the perfect of *ludo*; and the number of false quantities is surprisingly large, e.g. the following, among

many others, occur more than once: *devorare, niger, ratio, sitim, caro* (flesh).

Readings from Ovid. Edited by A. DUTHIE. London: Harrap, 1929. 1s. 6d.

THIS 'is meant as a first Latin verse book.' It contains easy selections, dealing for the most part with Ovid's life, together with short notes and a vocabulary. There are rather too many pieces about the miseries of exile; they are, it is true, generally easy to construe, but one wearies of the *nihil hic nisi triste videbis* strain. However, there are two long stories from the *Fasti* which will give the reader a better idea of Ovid's powers. The exposition of the elegiac metre is very clear and interesting.

Advanced Latin Tests. By J. M. MILNE.

Pp. 80. London: Harrap, 1929. 1s. THIS book contains forty papers, in each of which there is (1) a Latin passage of some twenty lines for transla-

tion into English; (2) an English passage of about the same length together with detached sentences for translation into Latin. The Preface says: 'The material presented in this book is the result of many years' experience in training students for the Leaving Certificate of the Scottish Education Department.' In an English school they would suit a form which had done about a year's work after passing a Matriculation examination. The papers are very well set.

Progress Tests in Latin. By B. L. ULLMAN and A. W. SMALLEY. The Macmillan Company, New York (London: Macmillan), 1928. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a series of papers in elementary Latin. The pages are perforated so that they can be detached and given up when the spaces reserved for the answers have been filled. The questions are generally set in such a form that they can be answered in a word or two. W. E. P. PANTIN.

Adventures in Literature. By J. C. WORDSWORTH, M.A. Pp. 293. London: Heath Cranton, Ltd., 1929. 12s. 6d.

THE two strictly classical essays in this book are on the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius, and on Euripides. The former is on rather conventional lines: a short summary of the poet's life and his quarrel with Callimachus, an outline of the narrative, a catalogue of the shortcomings, an appreciation of the merits of the poet, and an estimate of Virgil's debt. But the author has a knack of grasping essentials and presenting them in a gently provocative form; there is, for example, a great truth in the remarks on p. 158 on the 'inferiority complex' of Alexandrine literature. Difficulties are sometimes created by refusal to accept the obvious; the point of the *Ibis* (p. 156) can hardly be regarded as doubtful since the publication of Mair's *Callimachus* (p. 5), nor is there any real doubt as to the meaning of the epigram on the *Aïra* (p. 154). *aïrios* means 'criminal,' the first word in each line is an excerpt from an imaginary lexicon, and the whole is simply the most untranslatable, the worst and rudest academic pun on record.

The essay on Euripides is in many ways equally conventional. The admitted weaknesses of the poet are dealt with in detail, and with occasional exaggeration, and it takes a second careful reading to show that the author is playing the part of candid friend to the poet, and really rather admires him. There are many shrewd criticisms throughout, e.g. on p. 244, the suggestion that the religious views

of Euripides were really as uncertain for himself as they are for us.

Comment on the first two essays, the *Paradiso* of Dante and the *Orlando Innamorato* of Boiardo, is not within the scope of the *C.R.*; but the reader who begins in the middle will certainly be led to start at the beginning. The book is interesting and stimulating, and will be found to improve on closer acquaintance.

M. M. GILLIES.

Xenia Bonnensis. Festschrift zum fünfundsiebzigjährigen Bestehen des Philologischen Vereins und Bonner Kreises. Pp. 167. Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1929. Paper, M. 7.50.

THIS well-printed volume contains five contributions, of which three deal with classical subjects. In the first article (*Die Einheit der vorsophistischen Philosophie*) Hans Oppermann is chiefly concerned to demonstrate that Democritus is fundamentally a *Vorsokratiker* who continued to champion the pre-sophistic standpoint in a new world. One section reviews afresh the influence of Leucippus on his follower. In the second article (*Ein vielgestaltiger Asklepiospaean*) Paul Bülow discusses the Paean to Asclepius, of which four versions have come to light in recent years. It is surprising that he shows no knowledge of the fact that Mr. J. U. Powell had referred to this paean in *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature* (pp. 47-9), and printed two of the versions in *Collectanea Alexandrina* (pp. 136-8). As may be learnt from Mr. Powell, the earliest

version (that from Erythrae) disagrees with the later copies in several important points. Bülow maintains that this version from Erythrae offers the original form of the paean, which was deliberately altered later for reasons of propaganda. Thus (1) the words *ἐν γῇ* (sc. *τῇ Φλεγυαίᾳ*) have according to him been omitted to allow another land than Thessaly (perhaps Epidaurus) to claim the honour of being the god's birthplace; (2) the insertion of *Ἀκροῶ* among the daughters of Asclepius is perhaps due to Athenian influence. Bülow also accepts the hard reading *δοκίμων* against *δοκίμους* of the later copies. The author of the paean may be, he thinks, the native of Troezen whose name, mutilated beyond restoration, occurs in Pseudo-Lucian, *Demosth. laud.* c. 27. Without further evidence it is hard to pronounce on this theory, but it must be admitted that the alternative explanation of the discrepancies which assumes that the earliest version is the most corrupt was always somewhat improbable on *a priori* grounds. In the third article (*Kallimachos und Homer*) Hans Herter offers a detailed interpretation of Callimachus' Hymn to Artemis. This is a valuable study of Callimachus' complex style, especially as regards his adaptations of earlier Greek verse (particularly Homer), his sophisticated realism, and the disconcerting changes of tone. Herter points out that previous criticism of Callimachus has often been in error through misunderstanding of his poetic aims. Nowadays we may still not approve, but we can at least comprehend. Herter shows himself very well read in Callimachean literature, and the footnotes contain some acute suggestions bearing on the interpretation of the text. As regards Homer, Herter sums up the matter thus: *Immer wieder zeigt es sich, dass Kallimachos ein Homeriker wie keiner war, aber alles weniger als ein Nachahmer Homers.* This is very true, and the writer is justified in another passage in calling attention to Callimachus' too often unnoticed originality. Occasionally Herter strays rather far from his theme, but these excursions, e.g. that on the treatment of children in Hellenistic Art and Literature, are often informing. E. A. BARBER.

The Gods in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Ritual Survivals in Fifth-Century Drama.

By ALFRED CARY SCHLESINGER. Pp. 142. Athens: P. D. Sakellarios, 1929.

THIS is a dissertation composed for a Princeton doctorate, and the earlier chapters are of the kind usual in such compositions, containing as they do an elaborate enumeration and classification of all the scenes in which supernatural beings occur, noting whether the part such beings play is regular (i.e., whether they take part in the action as other characters do) or formal, and subdividing minutely the aetiological, prophetic, and other allusions found in the speeches of such beings and of others. This part of the work, though thoroughly done, makes somewhat uninspiring reading, but it does serve to bring out the fairly constant differences which exist between the practice of

the three tragic poets, and the great increase in 'formality' in Euripides.

The remainder of the work contains a full discussion of the theories of a ritual origin of the various elements of tragedy put forward by Stuart, Ridgeway, and Murray. The writer's conclusion is that practically all these elements are better explained otherwise. Now and then he spoils his case by overstatement, but his conclusions appear to be on the whole sound. The work, printed in Athens, contains a very large number of misprints, only a few of which are included in the 'errata.' Perhaps *temeni*, on p. 31, is a misprint; otherwise it is an unfortunate plural of *temenos*.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

Das Problem der Tragischen Tetralogie. Von PETER WIESMANN. Pp. 63. Zurich: Gebr. Leemann, 1929.

THE writer of this Dissertation sets out to prove that the trilogy, or tetralogy, form was not due to any cause inherent in the nature of tragedy at any stage of its career; that even in the *Oresteia* the three plays (and the Satyric *Proteus* which went with them) were essentially independent, and the connections between them so artificial as to involve the poet in contradictions; that the performance of a group of four plays together was due to the external circumstances of the tragic contest, four being enough to fill a day, with the necessary pauses; that on some occasions groups of three or two plays might be, and actually were, presented in place of a group of four, and that the view which regards the trilogy as the extension of a three-act single play (such as the *Persae*) is mistaken. The fifth-century writers had in fact no name for a group of plays (whether three or four) as a whole, 'trilogy' and 'tetralogy' being terms introduced at Alexandria, and 'didaskalia' being (until Alexandrian times) an abstract noun denoting the 'production,' not the plays produced. There is not, perhaps, much that will be new in these conclusions to those who have studied the evidence, though everyone will not feel the same degree of certainty as the author in regard to all of them; but the evidence is very conveniently brought together and interestingly discussed, and the work ought to be useful to careful students. On certain points such students may differ from the author, e.g. as to the interpretation of the hypothesis to the *Septem*, according to which Aristias was second, *Περσὶ Ταντάλῳ Παλαιστῆς σατύροισι τοῖς Πρατίνῳ πατρὶς*, which Wiesmann takes as proving that Aristias presented only three plays against Aeschylus' four. It remains more probable that a name has dropped out, and Professor Garrod (whose conjecture is not mentioned in Wiesmann's discussion) almost certainly provided the right name when he suggested the reading *Ταντάλῳ < Ἀντράῳ >*. And there may be differences of opinion on other minor matters. But he shows quite clearly that there was nothing in tragedy or the tragic plot as such which required as essential a division into three or four, and he disposes

very usefully of some unfounded theories. The work as a whole may be thoroughly commended.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum. Vol. I., Part I.: Prehellenic and Early Greek. By F. N. PRYCE, M.A., F.S.A. Pp. viii+214. 4to. 246 figs., 43 plates. Printed by order of the Trustees.

Catalogue of the Greek and Roman Antiques in the Possession of the Right Honourable Lord Melchett, P.C., D.Sc., F.R.S., at Melchet Court and 35, Lowndes Square. By EUGENIE STRONG, M.A., LL.D., F.S.A., etc. Pp. x+55. 4to. 23 figs., 42 plates. Oxford: University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 63s. net.

THE first instalment of the new B.M. Sculpture Catalogue includes Branchidae, Xanthus, and the older temple at Ephesus, and takes the collection down to the Strangford Apollo, leaving, however, Etruscan and Cypriote work to be dealt with in the second part. It covers, that is to say, the first section of Mr. A. H. Smith's catalogue, published in 1892, where the material occupied 89 octavo pages. The collection has, it is true, increased since 1892, but the old catalogue included the casts, which the new omits, and the vast increase in size is mainly due to the increased detail of the entries. The Strangford Apollo, for instance, once dismissed in seventeen short lines, now takes nearly four times the number.

B.M. catalogues do not err on the side of insobriety in style, and this one is not exactly exciting reading. But that is as it should be. All the pieces are carefully described and annotated; practically all are reproduced. The collection of archaic sculpture is now adequately catalogued. We may hope that when Sir Joseph Duveen's new Elgin Room is built there will be room for it to be also adequately displayed.

Lord Melchett's catalogue is of a different order, and may be regarded as a second instalment of the revised Michaelis of which Dr. Poulsen's *Greek and Roman Portraits in English Country Houses* was the first. The revision, and this volume in particular, is on a scale of magnificence which would have made Michaelis stare and gasp.

The Melchett Collection is not of the first importance, but it includes two fine bronzes, some interesting marbles, mostly from the Hertz, Hope and Robinson collections, and a few vases and terracottas. It deserved a good catalogue and has got it. The fifty-two pieces are fully and ably discussed by Mrs. Strong, and admirably illustrated, mostly from Professor Ashmole's beautiful photographs.

A. S. F. GOW.

De Psychologie van het Grieksche Werkwoord, Beschouwing over oorsprong en beteekenis der vervoeving. By S. W. F. MARGADANT. Pp. xiv+90. 's-Gravenhage: J. Philip Kruseman, 1929.

THE sub-title of this work on the psychology of the Greek verb is 'Speculations on the Origin

and Meaning of Conjugation.' The book falls into two parts. In Part I. the author formulates his theory in general terms. He has been led especially by consideration of the Homeric verb, with its numerous perfects, imperfects, and aorists with present meaning, middle and passive forms with active meaning, active forms with middle meaning, and so on, to the opinion that the primitive Indo-European verb had originally only one voice (the active), one tense (the present), and one mood (the indicative). Lengthened forms of this original stem existed, viz. intensives, expressing subjective emotion. By differentiation these last acquired different meanings and became tenses and moods. The elements contributing to the formation of tenses and moods were perhaps related to emphatic and deictic particles. After briefly applying his theory to the Latin and Greek verb, especially the participle, infinitive and gerundive, and to case-inflection in the noun, the author passes in Part II. to examination of the several Greek tenses and moods. The future was an intensive present which later became a desiderative present. The line between the imperfect and the aorist has been drawn too sharply by grammarians, likewise the line between the subjunctive and the optative, which are ultimately identical. The gnomic aorist and the historic present are survivals from the time when there was as yet no difference between present and aorist. The perfect is a strengthened present.

After reaching his conclusions the author found his theory already developed in Bréal's *Essai de Sémantique* (1899), a work which in his opinion has received too little attention.

It will be clear that on many points Mr. Margadant is in agreement with well-known authorities, although, as he remarks, it would not be difficult to find the contrary opinions upheld by equally great, often indeed by the same, authorities. The chief faults of the Bréal-Margadant theory are perhaps its incapability of exact verification and its exaggerated faith in the importance of the search for origins as a means of understanding the phenomena here under consideration.

Mr. Margadant wisely warns school-teachers not to teach their pupils the contents of his book.

R. MCKENZIE.

Ancient Editions of Terence. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XXVI.) By J. D. CRAIG, M.A. Pp. 135. Humphrey Milford, 1929. 3s. 6d. net.

FOLLOWING on his *Jovialis and the Calliopian Text* (1927), Mr. Craig proceeds to consider the evidence of Arusianus Messius, Nonius Marcellus and Euphrasius. A representative list of some 200 passages is considered, each case on its own merits. The conclusion drawn, it would seem with reason, is that each of the three grammarians used a text which was in the main the same as that represented by the Bembinus; and that in particular there is little evidence for the use by any one of them of a text resembling either the Δ or the Γ branch of the 'Calliopian' family.

The result emerges perhaps most clearly in the case of Eugraphius; here *lemmata* have been most definitely disregarded, and the safe rule observed that a grammarian's evidence is suspect unless his comment be explicitly or implicitly relevant to the point at issue. A good illustration of such implicit evidence is given in Nonius' comment on *Phorm.* 330 (p. 121). Conversely, the rule would seem to have been disregarded, with unfortunate results, in the case of Varro's comment on *Ad.* 117, which leads the author to favour *scortatur* against the received *opsonat*. Varro surely offers no more than an etymological note on the verb *scortari*; and, as the Oxford editor notes, *Ad.* 102 should be taken into account. On *Eun.* 303 (*floci fecerim*) it is unfair to call Donatus' note 'cryptic'; for he or his redactor adds the illuminating words *deest vel*; which suggests by the way a lack of precision in Lewis and Short *sub voce*.

The general argument is not always clear; for example (p. 9): 'It is often necessary to make up one's mind as to what is the genuine Terentian version. For until that is decided it may be impossible to say "This is the prior reading, therefore it belonged to the earlier text. That is the substitute reading, therefore it comes later."' W. M. EDWARDS.

L'Oltretomba nell'Eneide di Virgilio. By G. FUNAIOLI. Pp. xi + 178. Palermo-Roma: Remo Sandron, 1924. 8 lire.

Virgilio. By PAOLO FABBRI. Milano-Genova-Roma-Napoli: Società Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1929.

ITALIAN patriotism continues to bring forth more and more books on Virgil. The first of these two books appeared several years ago, but it did not come till the present year into the hands of the editors of the *Classical Review*. Readers of this production of Professor Funaioli may be obliged to confess to some disappointment. The well-known scholarship of the author and the title of the book might lead them to expect an original study of some part at least of the philosophical and religious background of the *Sixth Aeneid*. Instead of this we find a pleasant survey of the whole book from a literary point of view, and so much material is covered that there is little room for detailed study of particular points. Yet sound judgment and appreciative enthusiasm have combined to produce an extremely readable work. The author is especially happy in showing how the language and rhythm of Virgil express at each point the intensity of his vision. That the underworld was a reality for the poet is emphasised, and that his whole art consists in making it real to the reader. In a few pages the author touches on the problem of Virgil's early Epicurean attitude, and he suggests agreement with those who do not see in the *Felix qui potuit* of the *Georgics* any evidence of deep sympathy with Lucretian philosophy. The author then proceeds to examine each passage of the *Sixth Aeneid* in order of occurrence, and his examination shows scholarly familiarity with the work that has been done

on the subject. Sometimes he adds a fresh point of view. Among such additions may be mentioned his suggestion that in 'nec credere quivi / hunc tantum tibi me discessu ferre dolorem' Aeneas is expressing a feeling of revolt against divine authority. At least one reader feels doubtful about this argument. Yet this and other similar suggestions are always made with real appreciation for Virgil's art. The quotations from Dante add not a little to the pleasure which the book must give to all lovers of the *Aeneid*.

The other book noticed here is of a different stamp. It is intended especially for the rising generation of Italian schoolboys and students, and it attempts to review in a short space the whole of the work of the poet. Emphasis is put on the social and political aspect of the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid*. The view that the whole *Appendix* is apocryphal appears to be accepted, and there is a short chapter on the life of Virgil. The last chapter entitled 'Dei eroi, Roma ed umanità' is the best part of the book, and the eloquence with which the author speaks of the 'Patria rinnovata' is truly impressive. There is little doubt that the book will serve its purpose well, and that at the same time it will not offend readers for whom most of its matter will be familiar. Reference to modern scholarship is made in frequent footnotes. S. K. JOHNSON.

[*P. Vergili Maronis*] *Culex-Ciris.* Iteratis curis rec. CAIETANUS CURCIO. Pp. xiii + 44. Turin: G. B. Paravia and Co., 1928. L. 5.50.

THIS is No. 50 of *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*, containing some prefatory remarks on F. Vollmer and various *codices*, text of *Culex* and *Ciris*, with critical apparatuses, and an *index nominum*—the whole redolent of antiquity. One can only hope that this book will be replaced speedily by something which will be much more worthy of G. G. Curcio's labours on the MSS. Or has the discoverer of Vat. 2759 come to regard the *Appendix Vergiliana* as quite incurable?

The *Culex*-text cannot be said to add anything very remarkable to Ellis's. It would be strange, indeed, if it did. In Curcio's nightmare of an *apparatus criticus* can yet be traced the internecine warfare of MSS. struggling for notoriety—Voss. (=Voss. 81) against V (=Vat. 2759) and L (=Laurent. 33, 31) against B (=Bemb. Vat. 3252).

Voss. gets no less than 19 specific mentions. Only 9 of its readings are given also for V. Their 10 apparent differences are made possible by Curcio's omitting to record V's evidence 5 (or 6) times and recording it wrongly 2 (or 3) times.

L, with some 47 mentions, contrives to furnish 5 true-to-text readings not otherwise found. Subtracting 3 for editorial oversights (of B, twice), we get 20 *recurrent* (depending on a conjectural chain) and 226 *rare*.

L's correctors, rather than L, seem interesting; though, to be sure, one can hardly judge of that or anything else from Curcio's statements, seeing that he can record L and omit B

11 times from v. 256 to v. 352, though both give the same reading 8 times in fact.

As for V_1 (by which Curcio means Vat. 1586)—it has 17 mentions, none of them, I think, from v. 23 to v. 317. From these emerges 1 'true' reading (2, if, as is possible, Curcio has mixed up V and V_1 at 3 *docta*). To risk a conclusion from Curcio's samples of V_1 , either L or V_1 is not wanted in any critical apparatus—perhaps, really, neither is wanted; so that, with Voss. out, BCV remain much where A. E. Housman put them in 1908.

Enough, I suppose, has been said to warn Curcio's reader against trusting lightly in the citations of MSS. to meet his eye. Far better if their readings were given absolutely unassigned, merely as alternatives to the text, and were given correctly.

So far as I have been at pains to follow it, Curcio's *Ciris*-text, strangely more readable than his *Culex*, seems much as in 1908. Of 11 new emendations advertised on p. xii I find 11 in his 1908 edition; but, as the Preface is undated, no complaint is registered.

D. L. DREW.

Rome et la Judée. By MICHEL S. GINSBURG. Pp. 190. Jacques Povolozky, 13, Rue Bonaparte, Paris, 1928.

THE controversies connected with the relations between Rome and the Jews in the last two centuries B.C. are still so far from being settled that there was room for a monograph on the subject which took account of recent literature. Dr. M. S. Ginsburg tells us in his preface that he is a pupil of Eduard Meyer, and has received advice from Professor Carcopino, from P. Jouguet, Israël Levi and Théodore Reinach in the preparation of his volume. This should guarantee his knowing, at any rate, any contributions of importance made to these controversies in recent years. His book will indeed be useful in exhibiting the present state of the questions concerned with references to a wide field of literature. Perhaps its most valuable part is that in which it brings to bear the principles governing Rome's action generally, in regard to the making of treaties, upon the special questions raised by Rome's treaties with the Jews. One notices some inaccuracies in its narrative which the scholars named in Dr. Ginsburg's Preface can hardly have passed. On p. 24, for instance, the expedition of Nicanor and Gorgias against Jerusalem seems confused with the expedition led by Lysias in person the following year. On the same page we are told that the victories of Judas Macca-baeus from 166 to 161 B.C. caused Lysias to change his policy; but the change of policy came in the summer of 162. On p. 50 Judas is described as the *frère cadet* of Jonathan; Judas was the elder. There are some odd omissions in the later part of the narrative—no mention, for instance, of Crassus's spoliation of the Temple in 54 B.C. The question how far the documents cited in the books of the Macca-bees are forgeries is one upon which a great deal turns. And here the destructive criticism of Willrich in his *Urkundenfälschung* needs to

be taken account of. It seems to me that the supposed letter of 'Ἰνναρος Lucius' (1 Macc. xv. 15-24) cannot really be saved. Dr. Ginsburg mentions Willrich's book in his bibliography at the end, but in his discussions leaves Willrich quite out of sight, although *Urkundenfälschung* appeared in 1924, and his own volume in 1928. Finally one must note with regret that the volume as a typographical production is deplorable; the type seems to have been set up by an imperfectly trained amateur, and misprints are pretty frequent; on p. 17 a whole line has got into a wrong place.

EDWYN BEVAN.

Sénèque: Dialogues. Tome IV. Texte établi et traduit par René Waltz. Pp. 129 (parallel pages are counted as one). Paris: L'Association Guillaume Budé, 1927.

THIS is the fourth volume of the *Dialogues* of Seneca, edited and translated for the Budé series by the Mr. Waltz of the University of Lyons. Each of the dialogues treated—*de Providentiâ*, *de Constantiâ Sapientis*, *de Tranquillitate Animi*, and *de Otio*—is prefaced by an introduction reviewing the circumstances, date, and plan of work, and by a short analysis of the difficulties in the text. In addition the book is furnished with a sufficiency of useful footnotes and with a modest *apparatus criticus* which appears to mark each departure from the Codex Ambrosianus and to give the source of the emendation adopted.

Mr. Waltz has produced a translation which both renders the sense of the original and is in itself most readable. While just in his interpretation, he is not concerned merely to find verbal equivalents, but attempts to express Seneca's thought in well-turned, spirited prose. This method may at times lead to a slight exuberance of language, a somewhat rhetorical fulness, which the severe judgment of the precisian might condemn; but Mr. Waltz escapes censure, for with a good understanding of his author he employs his eloquence not as a substitute for sense, but to commend and adorn it.

The textual criticism of Seneca owes so much to the eminent scholars Madvig and Gertz that a later editor can be little more than a gleaner in such minor difficulties as his predecessors have overlooked or insufficiently discussed. In this way Mr. Waltz makes a number of valuable suggestions towards the improvement of the text. Once or twice, however, he tries his hand at a passage which Madvig might fairly be allowed to have restored—not always in my opinion with a happier result. Thus in *De Tranq. Anim.* v. 3 I still prefer Madvig's *calumniam* to the *sacvitiam* of Mr. Waltz, and earlier in the same paragraph it comes as a surprise to find Madvig's suggestion of *satis satellites* contemptuously dismissed as 'un jeu de mots inutile.' A graver oversight occurs in paragraph iv. 6 of the same dialogue, where the editor claims credit for the reading *auditus est* as being an emendation from the *aditus est* of A¹; but in *Adversaria Critica*, p. 377, the former is definitely stated to be the reading of both A and Haase.

One other point: the co-ordination of the pages compares unfavourably with our own Loeb series. Whether owing to the insertion of footnotes or to the expansion of the translation, most pages overlap to the extent of a few lines, while on p. 17 the French lags so far behind as to lose twelve lines—a deficiency not completely made good till four pages later. It is a pity that a technical fault should mar the pleasure of using a translation otherwise so good.

W. H. SEMPLE.

Senèque: Tragédies. Tome II., Texte établi et traduit par Léon Herrmann. 254 parallel pages, brief introductions of one page or so to each play. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1926.

THIS translation of the *Oedipus*, *Agamemnon*, *Thyestes*, *Hercules Oetaeus*, and *Octavia* forms the second volume of Mr. Herrmann's version of Seneca's tragedies for the Budé series. In a work so large the editor must be complimented upon the uniform skill and accuracy with which he has carried through the translation. Though not inspired, it has the solid qualities of reliability, good sense, and straightforward expression, and there are few perplexities which its faithful persistence fails to unravel. In this regard it might be suggested that both text and meaning could perhaps be improved by a rather more frequent acceptance of emendations proposed by earlier scholars. Where error or confusion is manifest, it is surely an editor's duty to admit a correction which at once explains the corruption, suits the context, and is in itself good Latin. For example, in *Oed.* 878, I cannot see what is gained by printing (and translating) *parens*, when both Heinsius and Bentley have suggested *paes*—a reading which to my mind gives clear sense, but which Mr. Herrmann relegates to his *apparatus criticus*.

In an undertaking so great it is only to be expected that despite the most thorough revision certain smaller errors should remain. Altogether they are few in number and I mention them not to disparage Mr. Herrmann's careful work but to suggest improvement. To take one play alone, in the *Oedipus* the following words are omitted—*tabidos*, 148; *suo*, 157; *aeger*, 204; *soli*, 216; *praecipitis*, 249; *fretum*, 286; *purum*, 310; *infausta*, 351; *recentem*, 676; *vicibus* . . . *alternis*, 689 (of the alternation of night and day, cf. *Thyestes*, 813-4); *rudes*, 877.

What appear to be mistranslations occur as follows:

144. *sonipes in ipso | concidit gyro dominum-que prono | prodidit armo.* The rider is pitched over the horse's shoulders which drop forward: 'son flanc fléchissant' is wrong.

251. (of the sun), *bis sena cursu signa qui vario regis: this cannot be 'qui dans ta course entraîne tour à tour les douze signes,' for the sun completes his annual circuit of the ecliptic by moving backwards, sign by sign, against the apparent motion of the heavens.*

633. *invisa proles sed tamen peior parens | quam gnatus.* Mr. Herrmann quite misses the force of *peior*: 'le père est pourtant pire encore que le fils.' *Oedipus* was a bad son in killing

Laius: he was a worse parent in getting children by *Jocasta*.

768. *redit memoria tenue per vestigium | cecidisse, etc.* Mr. Herrmann: 'sur un étroit chemin je tuai . . .' But I wonder if the sense is not better suggested by 821: *levis exoletam memoriam revocat nota.*

1016. *dirimatque tellus abdita et quisquis sub hoc*

in alia versus sidera ac solem avium
dependet orbis, alterum ex nobis ferat.

The translation construes: 'un soleil opposé au nôtre,' a phenomenon I do not understand. I suggest that Seneca means the hemisphere south of the Equator, in the direction of the southern constellations and the Tropic of Capricorn, where the sun in December may well appear *avius* to dwellers north of the Equator. In *Stat., Theb.* i. 159-161, *avius* denotes the extreme declination of the sun both north and south,

... *quasque procul terras obliquo sidere tangit*

avius, aut Borea gelidas madidive tepentes igne Noti.

W. H. SEMPLE.

The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilization: A Study of the Ethiopian Type. By GRACE HADLEY BEARDSLEY. Pp. xii + 145; twenty-four half-tone blocks. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1929. 16s.

THIS conscientious thesis consists essentially of a list, compiled with praiseworthy industry, of representations of Ethiopians in Greek art. Such general comments as occur upon the subject of its title are not peculiarly profound nor enlightening. The author's style may not unfairly be sampled in a specimen quotation. 'Heracles is as well known as a heavy drinker as for his Busiris episode as witnesses Euripides' *Alcestis*.'

W. R. HALLIDAY.

Fortunat. Étude sur un dernier représentant de la poésie latine dans la Gaule mérovingienne. By D. TARDI. Pp. xvi + 288. Paris: Boivin et Cie., 1927.

Les Epitomes de Virgile de Toulouse. By D. TARDI. Pp. 152. Paris: Boivin et Cie., 1928.

THE Abbé Tardi deserves well of students of late Latin by these two publications. Venantius Fortunatus (we generally call him by two of his four names in this country) is a somewhat enigmatic figure, rising on occasion to the heights of *Vexilla regis* and *Pange lingua*, but at other times giving mere *nugae curialium*, to steal a title from a later age, such as letters of thanks to the royal nuns Radegund and Agnes, when they had asked him to an especially delicious dinner. M. Tardi describes the *fusion singulière qui s'est opérée en lui entre l'italianisme raffiné de la décadence, la rudesse barbare et la douceur chrétienne*, but I cannot but think that Wilhelm Meyer described him more precisely as the first of the medieval poets of France; though he came from somewhere near Treviso, he is a precursor of the courtier Abbés of a later age, just on one or two occasions stimulated by real religious emotion into true poetry.

M. Tardi's analysis of his style and vocabulary is valuable, and the proof of his imitation by writers of religious verse throughout the Middle Ages.

As for the *Epitomae* of that comic character Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, I doubt whether it was worth while to make a French translation; I had rather that the space had been occupied by an edition of his *Epistulae*, so that we might have had all his works in one volume. His real interest is his relation to the *Hisperica Famina* (where M. Tardi is at a disadvantage as he does not seem to know of Jenkinson's edition of them). Did one of his disciples take to Ireland the secret of the twelve Latinities and *scinderatio sonorum*? M. Tardi does not help us much here; but we shall continue to cherish the recorder of the episode of how the grammarians Galbungus and Terentius wrangled for fourteen days and fourteen nights on the vocative of *ego*—a rich theme.

S. GASELEE.

Il Codice 528 della R. Biblioteca di Padova.
By FEDERICO AGENO. Pp. 224. Padova:
Stab. Tipografico L. Penada, 1928.

A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY MS. by various hands. It contains a miscellany of short Latin pieces, mostly metrical, including both classical and medieval material. From amongst the non-classical pieces a *Rhythmus exhortatorius ad clericos* is selected for detailed treatment; its rhythms and rhymes are carefully analysed; the conclusions drawn should be of interest to students of this type of poetry. No date is suggested for its composition.

In the classical portion attention is chiefly directed to the section *P. Maronis Carmina* (fols. 70a-77a), and in particular to the *Elegiae in Maecenatem* (p. 46 ff.). A collation of the readings of the Codex for the *Elegiae* is given. As might be expected, it does not offer any striking novelty, nor does it contribute appreciably to the solution of the principal difficulties of that work. Its individual peculiarities are mostly of the nature of errors or bad suggestions, unless an exception might be made in favour of *posuisse* (II. 16). As regards its relations to other MSS., it shows close affinity with the family Z (Vollmer), and some with B and the Monacenses; with the 'Enochian' group, which appears in the apparatus of the Oxford Text, it has practically none.

Considerable space is devoted to a general discussion of some of the chief problems involved in the interpretation of the *Elegiae*. Amongst other points, the question of Maecenas' participation in the campaigns of Octavian is examined in connexion with I. 41 ff.; and on I. 129-132 the suggested identification of Hesperus with Phaethon is considered at length, in particular the evidence supposed to be afforded by Euripides' *Phaethon* for a marriage of that hero with Aphrodite. The tendency is generally to question the definite conclusions which have been arrived at by certain scholars in the past. The solitary emendation offered (I. 37, *marmora graminei*) does not commend itself.

W. M. EDWARDS.

Spigolature Glottologiche (Quaderno terzo).
Il nome 'ITALIA' nella prosodia, nella fonetica, nella semantica. By MICHELE ORLANDO. Pp. xv+126. Torino, Vincenzo Bona, 1928. L.30.

NOT satisfied with the traditional explanation of *Italia* (or rather *Italía*) as 'Land of the Bull-calf' (*ἱταλός*, i.e. *ἱταλός*, Lat. *vitulus*), the author of this brochure looks for a more glamorous one. He finally selects **Diei-talia*, 'the Land of Day' or 'the Land of Light,' and with patriotic zeal, endeavours to surmount the obstacles, formidable obstacles, which lie between him and his goal.

Certainly **Diei-talia* might become **Djitalia* and finally *Italia* (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, p. 244; p. 263); but—and this is the first obstacle—the initial I must be long.

Now it has never been questioned that the I of *Italia* 'Italy' and of *Italus* 'an Italian' is short. Only in Epic poetry, from Virgil onwards, do we find *Italia* with long I. Lucilius' iambic senarius quoted by Lucian Mueller in his discussion of the scansion of *Italia* (*Res Metrica*, second edition, p. 436) can scan only with a short I (Lucil. 825 ed. Marx):

Detrusu' tota vi deiectu' que Italia.

The fifth foot is a tribrach, [*u'qu(e) Ital*]. Nonius, who cites it (289, 1), ascribes it to Book XXIX. of the Satires, and we know that Lucilius used iambic (and trochaic) metre in that book. The line which Marx with much probability makes its neighbour is the iambic senarius (824):

Hoc tum ille habebat et fere omnem Apuliam
ille referring to Hannibal.

How does the author deal with this difficulty? Recognising that the line must be an iambic senarius he scans 'through a brick wall,'

Detrusu' tota vi deiectu'qu(e) Itäljā,

and seems entirely blind to the fact that the change of *i* to *j* would make the second syllable long 'by position' (*Itälja*, see Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse*, p. 141).

He goes on to face the second obstacle. Quintilian (*Inst.* I. 5, 18) as clearly as possible tells us that the word *Italia* was invariably pronounced with the first syllable short, and that the lengthening of this syllable was a poetic licence (i.e., to enable the word to take its place in a dactylic hexameter): *Italiam* (with long first syllable) . . . *extra carmen non deprehendas*.

Signor Orlando assumes that Quintilian, the leading authority on Latin in Rome, did not know the ordinary pronunciation of *Italia*, and mistakenly inferred, from the occurrence of *Italus* in Virgil, that the initial I was originally short. How, he asks, can we explain Virgil's lines

Italiam fato profugus, etc.?

Lucian Mueller's explanation (*De Re Metrica*, loc. cit.) is satisfactory enough, viz., that Virgil availed himself of the form found in Greek Epic verse, where words of the scansion *uuu* might take the scansion *-uu*. And Mueller quotes suitable parallels, e.g. Virgil's *Sicelides*, etc.

A third obstacle appears in the path. Oscan coins, of the time of the Samnite War, show *VITELIU* for Latin *ITALIA*. The U-consonant in the Oscan alphabet was written exactly like an E which lacks the middle horizontal stroke. In one coin (only one) the middle stroke appears, presumably by mistake, and we have the unique form *EITELIU*. Signor Orlando seizes this weapon which chance offers him, and tries to get rid of the *V* of *VITELIU*.

Enough has been said to indicate that the old etymology, whether true or not, of *Italia*, still holds the field. **Diei-italia* is not proved, any more than **Joui-italia*, with which also Signor Orlando toys, though he has to indulge in a veritable 'salto di morte' when he passes from *jotalia* to *italia*.

It would have been equally patriotic to abide by the verdict of Varro and Verrius Flaccus, who were likely to know the truth about the name of their country.

Incidentally, no mention is made of the latest addition to our knowledge of the passage in Festus' epitome of Verrius Flaccus (Lindsay, *New Evidence for the Text of Festus*, in *Class. Quart.* X., p. 111). At the end of the tenth century Bishop Grauso of Ceneda wrote a commentary on the *Etymologiae* of Isidore, and made use of a full MS. of Festus *De Significatu Verborum*, a MS. now unfortunately lost. His commentary has been recently published by Professor J. Whatmough in the *Bulletin Du Cange* (Vol. II., p. 57; p. 134, *Scholium in Isidori etymologias Vallucelliana*).

Grauso's note on Isid. *Etym.* 14, 4, 8 is:

DE ITALIA *Italia ob vini copiam Oenotria appellata est; Italiam Cato appellatam ait ab Italo rege, Timaeus quod in ea boum quondam fuerit multitudo, Graecos autem antiquos solitos esse vocare tauros italos a quibus videntur dicti vituli.*

The note was published in the *Classical Quarterly* in 1916, and Wessner called attention to its importance in *Bursians Jahresbericht*, 118, 76. The new evidence necessitates a change in the small Teubner edition of Festus (94, 10). For *ab Italis <itali> sunt dicti* read *ab italitis sunt dicti*.

J. D. CRAIG.

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami, denuo recognitum et auctum. Per P. S. ALLEN, M.A., D.Litt. et H. M. ALLEN. Vol. VII., 1527-1528. Oxonii, MCMXXXVIII. Pp. i-xxiii, 1-560.

THE seventh volume of this great work is chiefly occupied with the attacks on Erasmus in Paris, Spain, and elsewhere, and with his defence of his writings. Letter 1920 from Charles V. shows that he had little to fear from his enemies except annoyance, and the Pope's brief to the Archbishop of Seville is to the same purport. Henry VIII., on September 8, 1527, wrote to offer him a refuge in England. This was politely declined, ostensibly on the ground of health and the danger of travelling, really, no doubt, because of the rumours of discord between 'Jove and Juno.' Letter 1960 is a polite reminder to Katharine of Aragon that he had written at her request *Christiani Matrimonii Institutio*, and received no acknowledgment. There are twelve letters in the volume addressed to English correspondents and seven from them. Hector Boece informs him that his paraphrases are studied in Aberdeen. Few scholars could ever have said with more truth than he (letter 1885), that the whole world was his country, and all good scholars were his kinsmen. Letters 1887 (advice to a monk to stay in his cloister) and 2037 (*inter alia* on the cult of saints) are well worth reading. Letters 1948 and 1949 are the prefaces to the *Ciceronianus* and the *De Pronuntiatione*.

G. C. RICHARDS.

Kleine Schriften. Von FRANZ BUECHELER. Zweiter Band. Pp. vi+518. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1927. R.M. 18; bound, R.M. 20.

THIS instalment contains papers published from 1871 to 1883. They are nearly all concerned either with Latin or with the Italic dialects. The important articles on the Cippus Abellanus and the Curse of Vibia are included, and there are seven valuable papers entitled 'Altes Latein.' Most of the items are reprinted from *Rheinisches Museum*. The editors, O. Hense and E. Lommatzsch, have added a few helpful notes and references.

W. B. ANDERSON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Albertini (E.) *L'Empire Romain*. Pp. 462; 1 map. (Peuples et Civilisations, IV.) Paris: Alcan, 1929. Paper, 50 fr.

Baynes (N. H.) *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury, compiled with a Memoir by N. H. B.* Pp. 184. Cambridge: University Press, 1929. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Bethe (E.) *Homer. Dichtung und Sage*. Zweiter Band. I. Teil: *Odyssee*. Mit einem

Beitrag von F. Studniczka. Zweite Auflage. II. Teil: *Kyklos; Zeitbestimmung*. Nebst den Resten des Troischen *Kyklos*. Zweite Auflage. Pp. xxii+398. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Cloth and boards, Rm. 16 (unbound, 14).

Brock (A. J.) *Greek Medicine, being extracts illustrative of medical writers from Hippocrates to Galen*. Pp. xii+256. (The Library

- of Greek Thought.) London: Dent, 1929. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Brown** (A. C. B.) *The Shorter Livy* (Books XL-XLV). Arranged and edited for the use of schools. Pp. xxi+183. (Bell's Shorter Classics.) London: Bell, 1929. Cloth, 3s. (without vocabulary, 2s. 6d.).
- Cantarella** (R.) *L'Edizione Polistica di Omero. Studi su la tradizione del testo e le origini dei poemi*. Pp. 275. Salerno: M. Spadafora, 1929. Paper, Lit. 50.
- Cary** (M.) and **Warming** (E. H.) *The Ancient Explorers*. Pp. 270; 15 maps. London: Methuen, 1929. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Corinth**. Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. IV, Part I. Decorated architectural terracottas. By I. Thallon-Hill and L. S. King. Pp. xii+120; 48 figures, V plates. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press, 1929. Cloth.
- de Gubernatis** (M. L.) *Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Libri. Ad fidem codicis Medicei recensuit M. L. de G. Libri III-V*. Pp. xii+180. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum, N. 52.) Turin etc.: Paravia, 1929. Paper, L. 14.
- Dixon** (W. M.) *Hellas Revisited*. With illustrations by M. R. L. Bryce. Pp. xi+209; 16 illustrations, 2 maps. London: Arnold, 1929. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Ehrenberg** (V.) *Vom Beginn der Geschichte Europas*. Pp. 23. Prag: Taussig, 1929. Paper, M. 1.20.
- Flinck-Linkomies** (E.) *De ablative absoluto quaestiones*. Pp. 272. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Ser. B. Tom. XX. No. 1.) Helsingfors, 1929. Paper.
- Frazer** (Sir J. G.) *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex. The Fasti of Ovid* edited with a translation and commentary. In 5 volumes. Pp. xlv+1855; illustrations and plans. London: Macmillan, 1929. Cloth, 126s. net.
- Gardner** (M. C.) *A Latin Book for Beginners*. Parts I and II. Pp. 224. London: Milford, 1929. Cloth, 3s.
- Glover** (T. R.) *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World*. Pp. 122. Cambridge: University Press, 1929. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Griscom** (A.) *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth, with contributions to the study of its place in early British history by A. G., together with a literal translation of the Welsh MS N° LXI of Jesus College, Oxford, by R. E. Jones*. Pp. xiv+672; 16 photographs of MSS. London: Longmans, 1929. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Helms** (F. B. R.) *The King's Market and Other Studies*. Pp. xii+365. Published by the University of Colorado, Boulder, 1929. Cloth, \$1.
- Helm** (R.) *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik und ihr Wert für die Literaturgeschichte*. Pp. 98. (Philologus Supplementband XXI, Heft II.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1929. Paper, M. 7.50 (bound, 9).
- Homo** (L.) *Roman Political Institutions from City to State*. Pp. xviii+403. (The History of Civilization.) London: Kegan Paul, 1929. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Hutton** (N. K.) *The Gaisford Greek Prize Composition for 1929*. Pp. 11. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie and Co., 1929. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Körte** (A.) *Hellenistic Poetry*. Translated by J. Hammer and M. Hadas, with a Preface by E. D. Perry. Pp. xix+446. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, \$4.
- Kuhnmuensch** (O. J.) *Early Christian Latin Poets from the Fourth to the Sixth Century*. With an Introduction, Translation, Commentary, and Notes. Pp. xiv+472; illustrations. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1929. Cloth, \$2.40.
- Laistner** (M. L. W.) *A Survey of Ancient History to the Death of Constantine*. Pp. xiii+613; 40 plates, 15 maps. Boston, etc.: D. C. Heath, 1929. Cloth, \$3.80.
- Laurand** (L.) *Cicéron est intéressant*. Pp. 60. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1929. Paper, 6 fr.
- Paganelli** (D.) *Propertius. Élégiés. Texte établi et traduit*. Pp. xxi+340. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1929. Paper, 25 fr.
- Palaeographia Latina**. Part VI. Edited by W. M. Lindsay. Pp. 68; 10 plates. St. Andrews University Publications, XXVIII.) London: Milford, 1929. Paper, 5s. net.
- Patrick** (M. M.) *The Greek Sceptics*. Pp. xxi+339. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.
- Perry** (F.) *The Comedies of Terence translated into English*. Pp. viii+366. Oxford: University Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Sargeant** (G. M.) *Classical Studies*. Pp. 285. London: Chatto and Windus, 1929. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Sjögren** (H.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum Epistularum Libri Sedecim. Fasciculus secundus libros V-VIII continens*. Pp. 199. (Collectio Scriptorum Veterum Upsaliensis.) Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1929. Paper, kr. 6.50.
- Valmin** (N. S.) *Inscriptions de la Messénie*. Pp. 48; 20 plates. (Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets Årsberättelse 1928-1929, IV.) Lund: Gleerup, 1929. Paper.
- Vollebregt** (J. C.) *Symbola in novam Eunapii Vitarum editionem*. Pp. 142. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1929. Paper.
- Warsher** (T.) *Pompeii in three hours*. Pp. 156; 100 illustrations and plans. Rome: Industria Tipografica Imperia, 1930 (*sic*). Paper.
- Wedek** (H. E.) *Humour in Varro and Other Essays*. Pp. 112. Oxford: Blackwell, 1929. Vellum and boards, 6s. net.
- Willoughby** (H. R.) *Pagan Regeneration. A Study of Mystery Initiations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Pp. xi+307. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1929. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

0
y
,
:
.
:
,
n
is
9-
,)
r,
e.
ka
8-
iii
a :
p.
e :
(c).
ner
29.
A
co-
go :
am-
6d.